00048891

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016

A
DISSERTATION
ON THE
LANGUAGES, LITERATURE,
AND MANNERS OF
EASTERN NATIONS.

Originally prefixed to a DICTIONARY,
PERSIAN, ARABIC, and ENGLISH.

THE SECOND EDITION.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

PART II.

Containing ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS.

TOGETHER WITH

FURTHER REMARKS ON

A New Analyſis of Ancient Mythology:

IN ANSWER TO

An APOLOGY, addreſſed to the Author, by
JACOB BRYANT, ESQ.

48891

BY JOHN RICHARDSON, ESQ. F.S.A.
OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE,
AND OF WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD.

OXFORD:
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS.
SOLD BY J. MURRAY, No. 32, FLEETSTREET, LONDON;
AND BY D. PRINCE, OXFORD.
M DCC LXX VIII.

17 1778

00048891

A DISSERTATION ON THE LANGUAGES, LITERATURE, AND MANNERS OF EASTERN NATIONS.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

SECT. I.

The connexion of Language with Manners. The origin of antient tongues involved in darkness. Short history of the Arabic. The character now in use nvented in the tenth century. Pag. 1

SECT. II.

Strictures on the language of Ancient Persia. The inconsistencies of various writers with regard to Zoroaster and his works. The Sadder published by Dr. Hyde; and the Zend Avesta by Du Perron not authentic. The Zend language not genuine. Observations on the Farsi and Pehlavi dialects. The specimens of old Persian in the Religio Veterum Persarum simply modern language in ancient characters. p. 12

CONTENTS.

SECT. III.

Changes introduced, by the Arabian conquest, in the government, religion, and language of Persia. The Macedonians and Arabians persecute the religion of the Magi; and destroy their books. Probable causes of this severity. The Parsis fly from the Arabian proscription, and settle in Guzerat and other places. They acknowledge that their books are of modern date. The Persian language neglected by the Mohammedans till the tenth century. Becomes blended with Arabic on its revival. Singular attention paid by Eastern princes to learned men. Decline of Oriental literature after the invasions of Gengiz Khan and Tamerlane. Leading distinctions between Western and Eastern genius. The usefulness of the Persian and Arabic languages in Hindostan. p. 20

CHAPTER II.

SECT. I.

Eastern language and literature may throw great light on ancient history, mythology, and manners. Systematic writers on the actions of mankind always to be doubted. The Grecian history of Ancient Persia questionable. The great

object of hiſtory to improve ſociety. Improbability not intitled to our belief, altho' tranſmitted to us by celebrated writers. Uncertainty of hiſtory in general; and the propriety of impartial reſearch. p. 37

SECT. II.

A ſhort view of the early periods of Perſian hiſtory. Like thoſe of other nations disfigured by the marvellous; yet not entirely to be rejected. Diſagreement between the Grecian and Aſiatic hiſtory of Perſia. Invaſion of Xerxes improbable. Outlines of the Macedonian conqueſt from Perſian hiſtorians. p. 47

SECT. III.

The Greek language cultivated in the Eaſt. All the ancient Perſian books not deſtroyed by the Arabians. Obſervations on Oriental Tradition, Pride of blood and Genealogy. Hiſtorians greatly patronized in the Eaſt. Aſiatic hiſtories numerous. The Greek hiſtorians neglected in the Eaſt. Probable reaſons for this neglect. p. 63

SECT. IV.

Contradictions in Greek Hiſtorians and Chronologers. Queen Semiramis. The Argonautic expedition. Seſoſtris. p. 82

SECT. V.

The Chronology of the Sacred Writings perplexed by endeavouring to reconcile it with that of the Greeks. An attempt to adjust the Seventy years Captivity. Building on Eastern proper names, unsupported by facts, the rock on which Chronologers have split. p. 89

SECT. VI.

Usefulness of the Arabic and Persian languages in throwing light on early times. Strictures on Mr. Bryant's New System or Analysis of Ancient Mythology. p. 104

CHAPTER III.

SECT. I.

Observations on Eastern manners. Conjectures on channels through which Eastern customs may have flowed into Europe. Improbability of the expedition of Oden from the Euxine to Scandinavia. Tartary the great officina gentium *of the barbarous invaders of the Roman empire. Mistakes of our greatest writers with regard to the Tartars. An example brought from Montesquieu.* p. 136

SECT. II.

Prevalence of the Feudal System in the East in

early times. Traces of it in Persia; in Arabia; in Hindostan; in Turkey; in Tartary. Apparently introduced into Germany and Scandinavia, by the Tartars, before the irruption of the Goths into the Roman states. p. 150

SECT. III.

Eastern notions of Supernatural Beings. Idea of the Peri or Faery System. The doctrine of enchantments originally Persian. Belief in Guardian Angels. Influence of this belief on their government and private life. Talismans, amulets, fascination. p. 165

SECT. IV.

Observations upon the old Persian era. Every month, every day, and every action of man supposed to have been under the superintendance of particular angels. Short account of the festivals celebrated by the Persians in honour of those angels. The Asiatics in general strongly attached to omens, astrology, divination, and dreams. p. 181

SECT. V.

Traces of Chivalry in the East. Importance of Women among the Arabians, Persians and Tartars. p. 194

SECT. VI.

Conjectures on Eastern Music. p. 208

CONTENTS.

SECT. VII.

Private war among the Eastern nations compared with that which prevailed in Europe during the middle ages. Compositions for homicide. The holy months of the Arabians contrasted with the Treuga Dei, and Pax Regis of Europe. Captivity and Slavery. p. 212

SECT. VIII.

Generosity and Hospitality of the Asiatics. p. 218

SECT. IX.

The Trial by Ordeal apparently of Persian Origin. p. 220

SECT. X.

On the dministration of Justice in the East. 222

PART II.

CHAP. I. SECT. I.

Supplemental observations on the Greek Historians. Their general merit acknowledged. Their inaccuracies complained of by their greatest admirers: Singular disagreement of chronologers and commentators. Further strictures upon the expedition of Xerxes. Grounds upon which Asiatic authors might consider the Greeks as tributary or dependent upon the Persian empire. Observations on Mr. Bryant's animadversions on this head. 289

CONTENTS.

SECT. II.

Of the Importance of women in the East. Their station in society not justly understood by European travellers. They enjoy in many parts privileges similar to those of Europe. The rise and progress of the Mohammedan religion connected perhaps with those privileges. Instances of the influence of women in public affairs. Marriage settlements. Divorces. Nuptial ceremonies. Singular modes of marriage. Dress of Eastern women. Many European fashions of great antiquity in the East. p. 330

SECT. III.

Of the Passive Obedience of Asiatics. The distinguishing manners of the East and West not always attended to by the learned. Mr. Bryant's criticism, on this head, considered. Implicit submission of the Carmathians to their chiefs. And of the Assassins or subjects of the Old Man of the Mountain. p. 353

SECT. IV.

Freedom of speech in the East. Instances of the deference of Asiatic princes to the complaints of their humblest subjects. Anecdote of Sultan Mahmoud. Destruction of a gang of dangerous banditti. Anecdotes of the Khalif Haron Arrashid. The barbarity of this

prince to his sister and Vizir. The undaunted gratefulness of an old man. Anecdotes of Hejjaje, an Arabian governor. Veneration for ideots in the East. Probable origin of Royal Jesters. p. 365

CHAP. II. SECT. I.

Reasons for the Remarks in the preceding sheets. Introduction to a further examination of Mr. Bryant's Mythology. 380 p.

SECT. II.

Inconsistency of the Chronology of the Analysis. p. 387

SECT. III.

Of Mr. Bryant's Theory of the Dispersion; and of the expeditions of the Sons of Chus. p. 394

SECT. IV.

Of Sanconiathon, Manetho, Berosus. p. 413

SECT. V.

Further observations on the Cuthite System; especially on Etymological principles. p. 434

SECT. VI.

CONCLUSION.

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

LANGUAGES, LITERATURE,

AND

MANNERS

OF

EASTERN NATIONS.

LIBR… OF … BOM… BR… OF … ROYAL AS…

CHAP. I.

OF EASTERN LANGUAGE.

SECT. I.

The connexion of Language with Manners. The origin of antient tongues involved in darkness. Short history of the Arabic. The character now in use invented in the tenth century,

THE Manners of Mankind must ever form an interesting enquiry. In every age and climate they display a wonderful diversity of character; and exhibit a picture so variously coloured, that we are convinced by experience alone, that the great original of the whole is Man. In all investiga-

tions of this important ſubject, Language claims a ſuperior degree of attention: in many points it will be found a moſt unerring guide; and, when viewed on philoſophic ground, may be conſidered as one great barometer of the barbarity or civilization of a people. A poverty of dialect is generally accompanied by ſavageneſs and ignorance: refinement is only advanced by a general diffuſion of knowledge; and knowledge muſt neceſſarily be confined within narrow limits, till written language has conveyed it through every order of men. No authority can, at the ſame time, ſo deciſively fix the peculiar habits and purſuits of a nation as the ſounds by which they articulate their ideas. The vanity of a traveller may heighten a plain ſtory into the marvellous; and the credulity of a hiſtorian may give a currency to the fiction: but, when radical words, in any tongue, are expreſſive of certain cuſtoms, objects, and modes of thinking; our reaſon cannot, for a moment, entertain a doubt of their exiſtence. *

INTO this train of thought I have been led, by that minute attention to the analyſis of the Perſian and Arabic idioms, which the conſtruction of my work unavoidably required: and I was willing to ſoften the extreme painfulneſs of inceſſant labour, on a ſubject naturally dry, by occaſionally tracing, together

with Eaſtern language, the oppoſition and coincidence of Aſiatic and European cuſtoms. Some points will of conſequence be touched, which, at firſt view, may have no apparent tendency to advance the acquiſition of thoſe tongues: yet the mere ſcience of words is, after all, but the outline of language; whilſt the colouring and expreſſion are only to be found in the virtues and the genius, in the vices and the follies of a people. In the courſe of this enquiry I ſhall have occaſion, at the ſame time, to doubt of many received opinions; and to queſtion the poſitions of ſome ſuperior men: whoſe want of knowledge in the languages of the Eaſt has produced much falſe reaſoning; whilſt their attachment to ſyſtem has heaped error upon error, and raiſed ſplendid fabricks upon pillars of ice. [b]

The origin of Ancient Tongues, like all reſearch into high antiquity, is naturally involved in perplexity and darkneſs; and every diſquiſition, however ingenious, muſt reſt at laſt on the uncertain baſis of fancy and conjecture. Yet, on this viſionary field, learned and pious men have diſputed with much want of temper. The original language of man has been conſidered as an intereſting purſuit; and advocates have been found for the ſuperior claim of every ancient tongue: Adam has

been taught dialects he never knew; and the language even of Omnipotence they have not blushed to determine with precision. To pierce through the obscurity of those distant periods, seems however above the powers of man; and to have no other tendency, than unprofitably to bewilder the human understanding. I shall avoid therefore those unknown regions, through which there appears no guide; and confine myself to the simple information of reason and probability.

The source of the *Arabic* language lies far beyond historic proof. Grammarians carry the older dialect to the family of Heber, the fourth in descent from Noah: and the more modern to Ishmael, the son of Abraham. These are Arabian tales: yet they apparently furnish this strong conclusion; That when nations have recourse to fable and tradition for the epoch of an invention, no period, within the demonstration of record, can possibly be found to fix its more exact commencement. Though rude perhaps in its origin, and gradual in its progress to improvement, the richness of the Arabic has been long proverbial; and many circumstances have concurred to render it not only the most copious of any known tongue; but to preserve it uncorrupted

amidſt all the political and literary revolutions of ſurrounding ſtates. [d]

THE Arabians were never conquered. The Romans, the Perſians, and the Ethiopians, made indeed, at different times, impreſſions upon particular diſtricts: but they were all too ſlight, and of too ſhort duration, to introduce any material alteration into their government, their language, or their manners. From very early times, this immenſe peninſula was divided into many ſtates; ſome independent, and others tributary to the Tobbas or Hemyaret ſovereigns of Arabia Felix. In thoſe ſtates many different dialects prevailed; the principal of which were the *Hemyaret* and the *Koreiſh*. The firſt, though the language of the moſt powerful of the Arabian princes, appears however to have been little cultivated by the independent tribes; or even by thoſe who paid them a feudal obedience: a remarkable inſtance of which is related by Mohammedan writers. An envoy from a feudatory ſtate having been ſent to the Tobba, that prince, when he was introduced, pronounced the word *T'heb*; which in the Hemyaret implied *Be ſeated*: unhappily it ſignified, *Precipitate yourſelf* in the native dialect of the Ambaſſador; who, with a ſingular deference for the orders of his ſovereign, without heſi-

tation or enquiry, threw himſelf inſtantly from the caſtle wall, and periſhed.

THE Koreiſh tribe were the nobleſt and the moſt learned of all the Weſtern Arabs: they were alſo the greateſt merchants, and carried on an extenſive commerce with every adjacent ſtate: whilſt the Kaaba, or Square Temple of Mecca, which, before the era of Mohammed was ſolely under their guardianſhip, drew annually a great concourſe of pilgrims from every Arabian tribe, and from every country where the Sabian religion prevailed. Where many ſtrangers are accuſtomed to aſſemble at ſtated times, politeneſs and refinement are a natural conſequence. Numbers of the pilgrims were people of the firſt rank, and poſſeſſed of all the ſcience peculiar to their country or their age. Great fairs were held during their reſidence; and a variety of gay amuſements filled up the intervals of their religious duties. Of thoſe entertainments, literary compoſitions held the moſt diſtinguiſhed rank; every man of genius conſidering not his own reputation alone, but even that of his nation or his tribe, as intereſted in his ſucceſs. Poetry and rhetoric were chiefly cultivated and admired: the firſt being looked upon as highly ornamental; and the other, as a neceſſary accompliſhent in the education of every leading man. An aſſem-

bly at a place called *Ocadh*, had been eſtabliſhed, in conſequence, about the end of the ſixth century; where all were admitted to a rivalſhip of genius. The merits of their reſpective productions were impartially determined by the aſſembly at large; and the moſt approved of their poems, written on ſilk, in characters of gold, were, with much ſolemnity, ſuſpended in the temple; as the higheſt mark of honour which could be conferred on literary men. Theſe poems were called *Moallakat* (ſuſpended), or *Modhahebat* (golden). Seven of them are in many European libraries, being the compoſitions of *Amralkeis*, *Tarafa*, *Zoheir*, *Lebid*, *Antara*, *Amru*, and *Hareth*.

A STORY told of Lebid and Mohammed diſplays the genius and manners of the Arabians in thoſe days. It was cuſtomary for the great poets to fix, upon the gate of the temple, diſtichs, or longer compoſitions, as a general challenge againſt the next meeting of the Ocadh aſſembly. Lebid had put up a couplet there, which was thought ſo ſublime, that none would hazard any thing in competition: till Mohammed at length placing by it the opening of the ſecond chapter of the Alcoran, Lebid no ſooner ſaw it, than he conceived it to be ſomething divine; tore down his own verſes; and immediately, from being a de-

termined enemy to the new religion, became one of Mohammed's firmeſt and moſt powerful friends. He was particularly uſeful in anſwering the lampoons of the prince Amralkeis, who continued, till his death, one of the prophet's keeneſt and moſt formidable opponents.[g]

From this uncommon attention to promote emulation, and to refine their language, the dialect of the Koreiſh became the pureſt, the richeſt, and the moſt polite of all the Arabian idioms. It was ſtudied therefore in preference to all the reſt; and about the beginning of the ſeventh century, became the general language of Arabia: the other dialects being either incorporated, or ſliding gradually into diſuſe. By this ſingular idiomatic union, like the confluence of many ſtreams into one large river, the Arabic has acquired an uncommon fullneſs: whilſt the luxuriance of ſynonymes; and the equivocal or oppoſite ſenſes of the ſame or ſimilar words; have furniſhed their writers with a wonderful power of indulging, in the fulleſt range, their favourite paſſion for antitheſis and quaint alluſion. Examples of the contrary ſenſes, in which the ſame words are received, may be found in almoſt every page of the Dictionary; but a ſhort anecdote from the hiſtory of the Khalifs will

ſhow how much Eaſtern genius pointed to ſuch diſtinctions. [b]

The great Mahmoud, Sultan of Ghezna, was the ſon of a ſlave; but having ſtretched his conqueſts over a great part of India and Tartary, in the beginning of the eleventh century, he ſent an ambaſſador to the Khalif Alkader, requeſting from that prince, as the fountain of honour among the Mohammedans, a title ſuitable to his rank and power. The Khalif, on account of the meanneſs of his origin, declined compliance for twelve months: till urged by the ambaſſador, and dreading Mahmoud's reſentment, he ſent him at length the ambiguous title ولي *veli*, which implies, *A prince*, *a friend*, and alſo *a ſlave*. Mahmoud eaſily penetrated into the Khalif's meaning; and ſent immediately 100,000 pieces of gold, with a wiſh to know, Whether a letter had not been omitted. Alkader underſtood him, and ſoon after diſpatched letters patent in full form, creating him والي *vali*; which ſignifies, without equivocation, a *Sovereign independent Prince*. [i]

As the Pagan Arabians had a number of dialects, they had alſo a variety of characters; but all of them ſo perplexed in their formation, and ſo difficult in their uſe; that, about the beginning of the ſeventh century,

they adopted the invention of *Moramer Ebn Morra*, a native of Babylonian Irak. In this character the Alcoran was originally written: it was afterwards improved under the denomination of *Cufik*; and continued in use till the appearance of the *Niskhi*, in the tenth century of our era. As this new mode of writing soon universally prevailed, the other gradually declined; and it is now only to be found in the manuscripts and inscriptions of the first ages of the Hejra. The *Niskhi*, which, with some variation or corruption, is the same which now prevails in Arabia, Persia, India, and other Eastern countries, is generally ascribed to *Ebn Moklah*, vizir to the Khalifs Al Moktader, Al Kaher, and Arradi, who reigned from 908 to 940 of our era: but it afterwards underwent the alterations and improvements of many eminent penmen of distinguished rank; particularly of *Nezam* and *Tograi*, vizirs to the Sultans Jelaleddin and Masud; and of *Yakut*, secretary to Al Mostasem, the last of the Khalifs of Bagdad.

SECT.

SECT. II.

Strictures on the language of Ancient Persia. The inconsistencies of various writers with regard to Zoroaster and his works. The Sadder published by Dr. Hyde; and the Zend Avesta by Du Perron not authentic. The Zend language not genuine. Observations on the Farsi and Pehlavi dialects. The specimens of old Persian in the Religio Veterum Persarum simply modern language in ancient characters.

THE language spoken anciently in Persia opens a wide field for unsatisfactory enquiry. Dr. Hyde derives it from that of Media; which is much the same as deducing one jargon of the Saxon Heptarchy from another. The union of those people, named by Europeans, *the Medes and Persians*, is of such high antiquity, that it is lost in darkness; and long precedes every glimmering we can discover of the origin of their speech: whatever their language was, therefore, it must have evidently been very early the same, with the

ſimple and common variation of provincial idiom. But in this tongue we have no genuine remains. We are told, indeed, that it was the language in which Zoroaſter promulgated his religion and laws; but this advances not our enquiry: for where or when did Zoroaſter live? and where do the works which have been attributed to him exiſt? The writers both of the Eaſt and Weſt ſpeak ſo vaguely, and differ ſo pointedly, with regard to this perſonage, that it is compleatly impoſſible to fix either the country or the period which gave him birth: whilſt the Zeratuſht of the Perſians bears ſo little reſemblance to the Zoroaſter of the Greeks, that unleſs Dr. Hyde, and other Orientaliſts, had reſolved, at all events, to reconcile the identity of their perſons, we ſhould have much difficulty to diſcover a ſingle ſimilar feature. Thoſe fragments of his ſuppoſed works which the learned Doctor has given us, under the title of the *Sadder*, are the wretched rhymes of a modern Parſi Deſtour (prieſt), who lived about three centuries ago: from that work we cannot then have even the glimpſe of an original tongue, nor any thing authentic of the genius of the law-giver: whilſt the publications of M. Anquetil du Perron (Oriental interpreter to the king of France) carry palpable marks of the

total or partial fabrication of modern times: and give great weight to the opinion of Sir John Chardin; That the old dialect of Persia (excepting what remains in the present language) is lost; that apparently no books now exist in it; and that the jargon and characters of the Parsis of Carmania and Guzerat are barbarous corruptions or inventions of the Guebre priests; without the least similitude to the inscriptions still discernible on the ancient ruins of Persepolis.[a]

In support of Chardin's general idea, I shall make a few observations on M. Anquetil's *Zend Avesta*. *In the first place*, The number of Arabic words, found both in his *Zend* and *Pehlvi* dialects, furnishes one strong presumption of their modern date; as no Arabic was introduced into the Persian idiom earlier than the seventh century of the Christian era.[b]

Secondly, The harsh texture of the Zend seems to be opposite to the genius of Persian pronunciation; and apparently incompatible with their organs of speech. There are certain sounds, to which we find some nations have an invincible antipathy. The French, the Italians, and other foreigners, can hardly ever be taught to articulate the English *th*. The Persians, if possible, entertain even a greater aversion to a sound somewhat similar, (or ra-

ther *t'h*, with a ſtrong aſpiration); and have accordingly, in every word adopted from the Arabic, changed it uniformly to *s*. But in M. Anquetil's Zend, the words in which it occurs are uncommonly numerous; and, in his alphabet, we have a character, which, to leave no doubt of the ſound he means to give it, he illuſtrates, by placing it on a line with the Arabic ث *th* or *t'h*. The *Farſi* and *Pehlavi* dialects, he ſays, at the ſame time, were ſiſter deſcendants from the Zend; and had come off the parent ſtock previous to the era of Zoroaſter: in that idea they muſt all have been ſpoken in Perſia at the ſame period: but neither in the Pehlavi, the Farſi, or in the more modern Perſian, is there a character to be found in the moſt diſtant degree expreſſive of this ſound. That men may be taught to conquer a defect in ſpeech, we know is poſſible; but that a people ſhould have powers to articulate with facility, in one cotemporary dialect, ſounds which they found impracticable in another, is a ſuppoſition juſtified by no example, and diametrically inconſiſtent with all the laws of nature.

Thirdly, It does not appear to have the moſt diſtant radical reſemblance to the modern dialect of Perſia; a circumſtance which all obſervation declares to be impoſſible, had it ever

existed as an ancient Persian idiom. No convulsions of government, no efforts of the learned, can ever so far alter a language, as to deface every line of resemblance between the speech of the present day and that of even the remotest ancestry: nothing but the absolute extirpation of the aboriginal natives can apparently accomplish so singular a revolution. If we look into the languages of modern Europe, we shall discover every where the strongest features of their Gothic or Celtic original; amidst all the refinement of Roman and Grecian embellishment. If we examine the dialect of the modern Greeks, notwithstanding their slavish subjection to the despotism of the Turks; we shall find corruption has but slightly disguised the original tongue. When we view the Syriac, long after that country had been under the rule of Alexander's successors, the texture we perceive unaltered; a slight mixture of Grecian words making all the difference. When we compare the modern Persian with the idiom which prevailed during the Sassanian dynasty, we observe it now only enriched by a copious introduction of Arabic words; yet still retaining every characteristic feature which it possessed before the Mohammedan conquest. But the Zend, so far from having the least similitude to one of the most

regular languages in the world, has more the air of a *Lingua Franca*, culled from the dialects of every ſurrounding country; grouped together with little pretenſion to grammatical propriety; and more pointedly reſembling the ſpells of Necromancers, than the language of a people, famed at all times for the melody of their accents. [d]

The laſt reaſon I ſhall offer, on this ground, is the uncommon ſtupidity of the work itſelf. The *Zeratuſht* of Perſia, or the *Zoroaſter* of the Greeks, was highly* celebrated by the moſt diſcerning people of ancient times; and his tenets, we are told, were moſt eagerly and rapidly embraced by the higheſt in rank, and the wiſeſt men in the Perſian empire. But could his ſucceſs have poſſibly been ſo remarkable, had his religion breathed only the moſt jejune puerilities; without one ray of genius to reſcue it from contempt? without a ſentiment that could elevate the ſoul, or give one dignified idea of Omnipotence? What is thrown into the notes from the *Vendidad Sadé*, will give a ſpecimen of the whole. It is by no means ſelected as the worſt: on that ground my choice muſt have been much perplexed. It firſt ſtruck my fancy; and my partiality for it was confirmed, merely from it's being ſhorter than many others, which had even a

LIBRARY

ſuperior claim to diſgrace the human under-ſtanding. From the whole therefore I re-main at preſent of opinion, that M. Anquetil has made no diſcovery which can ſtamp his publications with authority. He brings no evidence of the leaſt antiquity; and we are only diſguſted with the frivolous ſuperſtition and never-ending ceremonies of the modern Worſhippers of Fire.[e]

I SHALL now proceed to make ſome ob-ſervations on the modern idiom of Perſia; and to point out the origin of that ſingular and in-timate connection which it has long main-tained with the language of Arabia. Early in Perſia, as in every wide extended empire, there were many provincial dialects, diſtin-guiſhed chiefly by the names of thoſe provin-ces where they were ſpoken: the principal of which were the *Parſi* or *Farſi*, and the *Pehlavi*. The firſt was the dialect of Farſiſtan (Perſia Proper), and had an extenſive range over the moſt civilized of the lower diſtricts: whilſt the Pehlavi prevailed chiefly around the Ma-zenderan or Caſpian Sea, and in the more mountainous dependencies of the empire. So rude however was the Pehlavi conſider-ed, that, after having been diſcountenanced at court as early, it is ſaid, as the reign of Bahaman, about 400 years before Chriſt, it

was at length proscribed in a formal edict by Behram Gur, in the fifth century of our era; and soon after ceased to be a living language. The *Farsi*, on this event, as it had long been the principal, became now the only language of Persia; being subdivided into the *Zebani Deri*, or the language of the court, and the *Zebani Farsi*, the dialect of Persia at large. It is to this language, which seems to have been peculiarly cultivated by the great and the learned above twelve hudred years before the Mohammedan era, that we should apparently point our researches for Persian literature previous to that period: and not to the uncourtly Pehlavi. So early neglected by the superior orders of men, and confined entirely amongst the boorish, mountaineers, and unlettered peasants, it appears to be equally improbable, that men of genius should have preferred this rude idiom to the polished *Deri*; as to suppose a Voltaire to have written in the Bas Breton; or an Addison in the most rugged of our county dialects. [f]

The *Deri* was improved with uncommon care by the Sassanian princes; many of whom, as well as their vizirs and great officers, published works in it: which, though at present hardly known, are mentioned with high approbation by succeeding writers. Amongst,

the chief of thoſe royal and noble authors was Ardeſhir Babegan, the firſt prince of this dynaſty, who began his reign A. D. 202. He wrote a *Karnamé*, or journal of his public and private life: and alſo a work of morality; which being afterwards improved by Noushirvan the Juſt, (who flouriſhed in the ſixth century), was ſent by him to all his governors, as the invariable rule of their conduct. The *Zefer namé*, written by Bouzour, vizir to Nouſhirvan, is better known; having been modernized by the celebrated phyſician and vizir Avicenna, about the beginning of the eleventh century. Thoſe books, could they now be recovered in their original language, would apparently be an acquiſition far ſuperior to a thouſand ſuch volumes as M. Anquetil's *Zend Aveſta*. Excluſive of their intrinſic value, with regard to Perſian Hiſtory, manners, politics, and morals, they would ſhew the preciſe diſtinction between the ancient and modern dialects: for if what Dr. Hyde has given us, as the words of Ardeſhir, is authentic, the language of this prince, though called *Old Perſian* by that very learned gentleman, is actually, when decyphered, ſimply the modern in ancient characters: and if his book is written in the ſame tongue, (which is probably the caſe) the whole dif-

ference between the language of the early kings of Perſia, and that which now remains, ſeems to reſt entirely in the difference of character, and in the introduction of the Arabic; which began to take place in the ſeventh century of the Chriſtian æra.

SECT. III.

Changes introduced, by the Arabian conqueſt, in the government, religion, and language of Perſia. The Macedonians and Arabians perſecute the religion of the Magi; and deſtroy their books. Probable cauſes of this ſeverity. The Parſis fly from the Arabian proſcription, and ſettle in Guzerat and other places. They acknowledge that their books are of modern date. The Perſian language neglected by the Mohammedans till the tenth century. Becomes blended with Arabic on its revival. Singular attention paid by Eaſtern princes to learned men. Decline of Oriental literature after the invaſions of Gengiz Khan and Tamerlane. Leading diſtinctions between Weſtern and Eaſtern genius. The uſefulneſs of the Perſian and Arabic languages in Hindoſtan.

BEFORE the appearance of Mohammed, the Arabians, confined within their own peninsula, made no figure on the theatre of Asia; and were, in a political light, known only to be despised by the Grecian and the Persian powers. But the enthusiasm, genius, and intrepidity of one extraordinary man, soon changed the scene; and gave a beginning to revolutions equally rapid as complete. The numerous Arabian tribes Mohammed, by various means, converted to his faith, or subjected to his power; but died before any impression was made upon the adjacent states. Abubeker led the way to foreign conquest; and his successor Omar, in the short space of four years, saw the Khalifat extended from Egypt to the frontiers of India. Persia was one of the noblest acquisitions of the Mohammedan arms; the decisive victory of *Kadessia*, in the year 636, throwing this mighty empire under the Arabian yoke, as that of *Arbela* had formerly subjected it to Alexander. The consequences however of the two revolutions had nothing similar: the Macedonian conquest produced only a change of princes; the Kaianian dynasty of Persian kings giving way to the successors of their Grecian conqueror: but that of the Arabians proved a

radical ſubverſion of every characteriſtic circumſtance which diſtinguiſhes nation from nation. The ancient government of the Perſians was overturned; their religion proſcribed; their laws trampled upon; and their civil tranſactions diſturbed by the forcible introduction of the lunar for the ſolar calendar: whilſt their language, which the laws of nature preſerved from immediate and abſolute annihilation, became almoſt overwhelmed by an inundation of Arabic words; which, from that period, religion, authority, and faſhion, incorporated with their idiom.

THE worſhip of the ancient Perſians had unqueſtionably been very early corrupted. The reverence paid to the Sun and to Fire, which Zoroaſter conſidered perhaps merely as repreſentatives of Omnipotence, the fountain of light, ſeems to have been an idea too refined for the groſs capacities of the vulgar: who, without regard to the great inviſible Prototype, turned all their thoughts to the adoration of thoſe oſtenſible deities. Much abſurd and barbarous ſuperſtition muſt in conſequence have crept in, and clouded by degrees the purer faith of their anceſtors. Upon other grounds it will be difficult to account for that ſingular ſeverity with which Alexander firſt, and afterwards the Arabian

Khalifs, reprobated the tenets of the Magi; deſtroyed their books; and perſecuted, with unrelenting rigour, all who made profeſſion of their religion. [b]

THE Grecians and Romans had enlarged ſentiments of toleration. They adopted the gods of all the nations they ſubdued: and, in the belief, that every people and every place had their tutelary divinities, they were at uncommon pains to pleaſe them, and were equally careful in avoiding all offence. From Arrian we learn, that Alexander ſacrificed to the Babyloniſh gods and other Aſiatic deities; though then unknown in Greece: and we are told by Pliny, that the firſt endeavour of the Romans, when beſieging a city, was to diſcover the name of the guardian divinity (without which, it ſeems, they could make no invocation); when, by promiſes of greater honours than he had hitherto enjoyed, they endeavoured to bribe him to betray his former votaries. Such having been the extended ideas of the old Polytheiſts, we are forced to conclude, That ſome ſingular circumſtances of intolerance and horror had marked the Magian rites, which peculiarly provoked the vengeance of their Macedonian conqueror. [c]

A SIMILAR reaſon muſt account for that uncommon ſeverity with which they were

crushed by their Moslem masters. These enthusiasts, it must be confessed, knew little of the tolerant principles of the ancient Greeks; and considered it as a religious duty to establish their new faith with fire and sword. To the Christians, Jews, Sabians, and other sects, they paid, however, some show of respect; and permitted them, if averse to Moslemism, to follow their old belief, on paying a certain extraordinary tribute. But their fury against the Magi knew no bounds; destruction or conversion being the only alternatives they deigned to offer. The body of the nation chose the last; whilst the small remainder of confirmed enthusiasts sheltered themselves in the mountains of Kuhistan. Some retired to the isle of Ormuz; whence they afterwards embarked for Diu; and at length, towards the close of the eighth century, they obtained permission to settle in Surat, and other places in the territory of Guzerat: where their descendants, under the denomination of Parsis or Guebres, by avoiding all intermarriage with the aboriginal natives of Hindostan, still maintain themselves a distinct body of harmless and unpowerful people. [a]

It may be said, perhaps, that the religion and learning of the Magi was by no

means the ſingle object of Mohammedan devaſtation; the deſtruction of the famous library of Alexandria being another memorial of the execrable zeal of the Khalif Omar. It is true, that this great but bigoted prince, conſidering all books which coincided with the Alcoran to be ſuperfluous, and all that oppoſed its doctrines to be pernicious, iſſued his barbarian mandate to deſtroy that noble monument of ancient learning and magnificence: but ſtill there was nothing ſtriking in the perſecution of the Egyptians; the general mode of an advanced tribute being all that was exacted, for permiſſion to follow the various religious ſyſtems, which prevailed in that country previous to the conqueſt. *

These ſingular events, which marked the fate of the Perſian religion, joined to the unſucceſsful reſearches which have hitherto been made, ſeem to furniſh ſtrong collateral evidence in ſupport of the foregoing arguments: and lead us to conclude, with every circumſtance of probability, That the original works of the Perſian lawgiver have long ago fallen a ſacrifice to the ravages of time and of conqueſt; that the publications of M. Anquetil have no pretenſions to authenticity; and that nothing now remains, bearing the names of thoſe once celebrated books, but the abſurd

ceremonials of the modern Guebres; which preſerve, apparently, no nearer reſemblance to the ancient Worſhip of Perſia, than the corrupted tenets of the Mingrelians or Georgians have to the Chriſtian religion. The Parſis of Guzerat even acknowledge, that, ſo far from now poſſeſſing the ancient books of Zoroaſter, they have not ſo much as one ſingle copy ſaved by their anceſtors from the general wreck in the ſeventh century: the formularies which they now uſe, being only tranſcripts of a tranſlation by Ardeſhir, one of their Deſtours, who lived about 400 years ago. In Europe, we have had many inſtances of the forgery of books, in matters of mere curioſity; and we have found their detection difficult. But how much more powerful muſt have been the temptation to the Guebre prieſts on the loſs of the writings of their lawgiver; for rule was their object; and they have ever ruled with deſpotiſm. Abſurd ceremony ſeems to have uſurped the place of common ſenſe; and the barbarous dialect of the Zend may poſſibly have been invented, to throw a more impenetrable veil over their myſterious nothings. A Parſi cannot even pare his nails, or cut his hair, without hundreds of unmeaning prayers, and the moſt tedious and ridiculous obſervances. But

every omiſſion is gainful to the prieſt: abſolution muſt be purchaſed; and a fine is the indiſpenſible conſequence of the moſt minute and involuntary failure. [f]

From the ſeventh till the tenth century, the Perſian tongue appears to have laboured under much diſcouragement and neglect. Baghdad, built by Almanſor, became ſoon after the year 762, the chief reſidence of the Khalifs, and the general reſort of the learned and the ambitious from every quarter of the empire: but the Arabic language, in a literary as well as in a religious light, was long the only object of attention and patronage: whilſt the Perſians, ruled with the iron hand of religious tyranny, ſeem to have been remembered by the Khalifs only to be deſpiſed, plundered, and oppreſſed. But the revolutions of the empire changed at length the ſcene; and the acceſſion of the *Buyah* princes to the Perſian throne marked, in the tenth century, the great epoch of the revival of Perſian learning. [g]

The khalifat had now loſt much of its priſtine vigour; the fineſt kingdoms and provinces of the empire having been uſurped by various adventurers, who paid only a tributary obedience to the ſucceſſors of their prophet. Of thoſe feudatory chiefs, the moſt

powerful were the princes of the houſe of *Buyah*, otherwiſe called the *Deylemites*; who added to their high rank of kings of Perſia, the dignity of *Emiru'l'omra* to the Khalifs of Baghdad; an office nearly reſembling the *Maire du palais* to the *rois faineants* of the Merovingian race of France. An outward ſhow of reſpect and pomp was all that the Head of the Mohammedan religion now enjoyed; whilſt the ſolid power was completely engroſſed by the Emiru'l'omra. In this high ſtation, about the year 977, we find the great Azaduddowla; who firſt aſſumed the title of Sultan, afterwards ſo generally adopted by Eaſtern princes. He was born at Iſpahan, and had a ſtrong attachment to his native kingdom. He was an able general and an accompliſhed ſtateſman: he was munificent and learned. His court, whether at Baghdad or in the capital of Perſia, was the ſtandard of taſte, and the favourite reſidence of genius. The native dialect of the prince was particularly diſtinguiſhed; and became ſoon the general language of compoſition, in almoſt every branch of polite learning; after having been almoſt wholly neglected by literary men for above three hundred years. [h]

FROM the end of the tenth, till the fifteenth century, may be conſidered as the moſt

flourishing period of Persian learning. The Epic Poet Firdousi, in his romantic history of the Persian kings and heroes, displays an imagination and smoothness of numbers hardly inferior to Homer. The whole fanciful range of Persian enchantment he has interwoven in his poems, which abound with the noblest efforts of genius: and he has stamped a dignity on the monsters and fabling of the East, equal to that which the prince of Epic poetry has given to the mythology of ancient Greece. His language may, at the same time, be considered as the most refined dialect of the *older Persian* or *Deri*; the Arabic being introduced with a very sparing hand: whilst Sadi, Jami, Hafez, and other succeeding writers, in prose as well as verse, have blended in their works the Arabic without reserve; gaining, perhaps, in the nervous luxuriance of the one language, what may seem to have been lost in the softer delicacy of the other. [i]

FROM the above period, a literary rivalship seems to have subsisted amongst the Mohammedan princes who had dismembered the Khalifat; every Sultan considering it as an object of the first consequence, to number amongst his friends, the most celebrated poets or philosophers of their age. No expence

was ſpared to allure them to their courts; and no reſpect was wanting to fix a continuance of their attachment.[k]

THE Eaſtern princes ſeem indeed to have carried their attachment to men of genius to a very ſingular exceſs: even impriſoning them, if they ſuſpected them of an intention to retire. If they happened to eſcape, an embaſſy with preſents and apologies ſometimes followed the man of learning; and peremptory demands were often made, where gentler methods had not the deſired effect: a demand however ſeldom complied with, if the power of the ſovereign with whom they had taken refuge, bore any proportion to that of his competitor. I ſhall mention two examples. *Khakani*, a celebrated Perſian poet of the twelfth century, was a great favourite with the Sultan of Shirvan; but becoming at laſt diſguſted with the world, he deſired leave to retire into the religious order of the Derviſhes. The Sultan refuſing him permiſſion, he fled; but was purſued, brought back, and impriſoned for ſeveral months. Here he compoſed one of his fineſt elegies: but he was at length ſet at liberty; and ſoon after obtained leave to put his deſign in execution.—Mahmoud, Sultan of Ghezna, having invited ſome men of genius from the court of his ſon-in-law, the

king of Kharezmé, the celebrated *Avicenna*, who was of the number, refused to go; and retired to the capital of the Sultan of Jorjan. Mahmoud ordered immediately a number of portraits of this great physician to be copied; and sent them all around, in order to discover his retreat. The fame of his cures had, in the mean time, reached the Sultan of Jorjan; who sent for him to visit a favourite nephew, whose malady had perplexed the faculty. Avicenna supposed it to be concealed love: and, in the idea that the fair object might be one of the ladies of the king's Haram, he desired the chamberlain to describe the apartments of the palace, whilst he felt the prince's pulse. On the mention of a particular quarter, he perceived an uncommon emotion in his patient; but the naming of the lady who lived in it, entirely removed his doubts. The sequel is a perfect counterpart of the famous story of Antiochus and Stratonice. The prince was made happy. The king conceiving a great desire to see a physician of such penetrating genius, sent for him; and discovered him the moment he appeared, by one of the portraits which he had received from Sultan Mahmoud. But no menaces could induce the king of Jorjan to deliver him up. He loaded him, on the contrary, with riches

and honours; and protected him, as long as he chused to continue at his court, against the all-powerful resentment of that formidable monarch.[1]

AMONGST the most magnificent of the royal patrons of Persian literature were three contemporary princes, who reigned towards the end of the eleventh century; and were remarkable not only for their abilities and liberality, but for the singular and uninterrupted harmony which distinguished their correspondence. These were Malekshah Jelaleddin, king of Persia; Keder ben Ibrahim, Sultan of the Gheznevides; and Keder Khan, the Khakan, or king of Turquestan, beyond the Gihon. The Khakan was uncommonly splendid: when he appeared abroad he was preceded by 700 horsemen with silver battle-axes, and was followed by an equal number bearing maces of gold. He supported, with most magnificent appointments, a literary academy in his palace, consisting of a hundred men of the highest reputation in the East: Amak, called also Abou'l'najib Al Bokhari, who was the *Ustadu'l'shoara*, or chief of the Poets, exclusive of a great pension, having, amongst other articles of Eastern luxury, a vast number of male and female slaves; with thirty horses of state richly capa-

risoned, and a retinue in proportion, which attended him wherever he went. The Khakan used often to preside at their exercises of genius: on which occasions, by the side of his throne were always placed four large basons filled with gold and silver; which he distributed with a liberal hand, to those who principally excelled. [m]

But the invasions of Jengiz Khan and Tamerlane, in the beginning of the thirteenth, and end of the fourteenth centuries, gave violent checks to all the arts of peace. The Khalifat and all its feudatory princes were overwhelmed: and altho' Tamerlane, in a variety of instances, was a liberal patron of learned men; that was but a feeble compensation for the general desolation which he spread around; and the destruction of a number of magnificent patrons of the arts, who sunk under the torrent of his irresistible power.—The Turks soon after stretched their government, unfavourable to liberty and science, from Europe to the banks of the Tigris: whilst, in Persia, the bloody reigns of the detested house of Sefi concurred effectually in plunging those noble countries into that melancholy barbarism, from which Europe, during that period, had been gradually emerging. [n]

For near three hundred years, the literary fire of the Persians and Arabians seems indeed to have been almost extinguished; nothing hardly, during that time, which deserves attention, being known, at least, in Europe: yet enough exists, to give us a very high opinion of the genius of the East. In taste they are undoubtedly inferior to the Greeks, to the Romans, and to the best writers of modern Europe; but, in invention, they are excelled, perhaps equalled by none. The Arabians are distinguished by a conciseness of diction, which borders sometimes upon obscurity. The Persians affect, on the contrary, a rhetorical luxuriance; which, to a European, wears the air of unnecessary redundance. If, to these leading distinctions, we add a peculiarity of imagery, of metaphor, of allusion; derived from the difference of government, of manners, of temperament; and of such natural objects as characterise Asia from Europe; we shall see, at one view, the great points of variation between the writers of the East and West. Amongst the Oriental historians, philosophers, rhetoricians, and poets, many will be found, who would do honour to any age or people: whilst their romances, their tales, and their fables, stand

upon a ground, which Europeans, in ſome points, have hardly yet found powers to reach."

IN various other lights, the uſefulneſs of the Perſian and Arabic languages will appear evident, on the ſlighteſt examination. The high political conſequence of the Perſian, in the affairs of India, is too obvious and too generally acknowledged to require arguments to enforce it; whilſt the Arabic, totally neglected, or ſtudied with inattention, has never been viewed, in Hindoſtan, by Europeans, in the important light it ſeems to merit. Yet the intercourſe which the Arabians have maintained with that country, is ancient and intimate. For many centuries, previous to the diſcovery of the Cape of Good Hope, they were the chief traders in the Eaſt; and the commodities of India flowed into Europe, by the way of Egypt and Syria, almoſt ſolely through their hands. Their commercial ſettlements ſkirted the Indian coaſts: their tranſactions with the Gentoos were extenſive; and their language found its way where even their arms and their religion had made no impreſſion. The tranſactions, ſometimes amicable, but oftener hoſtile, in which the Hindoo Rajahs were engaged with the Mohammedan princes, long before the acceſſion of the houſe of Timur, opened likewiſe num-

berless channels for the introduction and incorporation of this great Mohammedan language; and gave it, in time, such an universal currency in Hindostan, that not only two thirds of the Persian, now in general use there, is pure Arabic; but a half perhaps of the Hindostan or Moors is Arabic and Persian: in the Malay, they also both abound; and they appear even to have found a place in the vulgar *Nagree* and *Bengal.* But that which has chiefly astonished me, is to find Arabic technically used, even in the *Code of Gentoo Laws.* If such words are actually in the original *Shanscrit*, it is a circumstance which will require a very nice explanation: for, upon general principles, we must, on that ground, question the antiquity of those laws; having at present no foundation to believe, that the Arabic was introduced into Hindostan earlier than the Mohammedan invasion A. D. 708, during the Khalifat of the first Al Walid. But if they are not in the original Shanscrit, and only occur in the Persian translation by the Pundits; there appears to be the same impropriety in their modernizing or translating those ancient law words, as there would have been, had Sir William Blackstone given only the English of such terms as *Certiorari* or *Fieri facias*, and omitted the original names of the writs. [p]

CHAP. II.

OF ANCIENT ORIENTAL HISTORY AND TRADITION.

SECT. I.

Eaſtern language and literature may throw great light on ancient hiſtory, mythology, and manners. Syſtematic writers on the actions of mankind always to be doubted. The Grecian hiſtory of Ancient Perſia queſtionable. The great object of hiſtory to improve ſociety. Improbability not intitled to our belief, altho' tranſmitted to us by celebrated writers. Uncertainty of hiſtory in general; and the propriety of impartial reſearch.

HAVING traced the progreſs of the Arabic and Perſian languages as far as is conſiſtent with reaſon, or conducive to utility; I ſhall now proceed to obſervations on other points, which will be chiefly comprehended under two heads: *Firſt*, Lights which Eaſtern language and literature may throw upon ancient hiſtory and mythology. *Se-*

condly, Cuſtoms apparently originating in Aſia, which, ſince the downfal of the Roman power, ſeem to have influenced the manners of modern Europe. In the inveſtigation of thoſe ſubjects, I am unavoidably led to queſtion the opinions of ſome of the moſt eminent men, in the literary world; who, little acquainted with the languages of the Eaſt, and intangled in the labyrinths of ideal ſyſtem, have built upon a baſis of no ſolidity, and extended error inſtead of diſcovering truth. Yet, whereever I venture, on any ground, to differ from exalted characters, I wiſh it may be underſtood, that I loſe nothing of that reſpect to which they are ſo juſtly intitled. It is the lot of humanity to err. We may venerate a Herodotus or a Newton, without enſlaving the mind by an acquieſcence in their failings: we may admire the nobleſt efforts of human wiſdom, without equally revering the unavoidable weakneſſes of human frailty.

Systematic writers, upon the actions of mankind, however ingenious and learned, are ever to be read with caution. Man, in the aggregate, is too irregular to be reduced to invariable laws. A ſlave to paſſion and to momentary views, the weakeſt ſprings have found force ſufficient to ſhake the mightieſt ſtates; and events of the deepeſt conſequence

have originated from causes which shunned all public view. But a framer of systems thinks not like other men: he forms nations, and he annihilates them: he establishes empires, and he destroys them; he assigns reasons for each fortuitous event; and defines, with mathematical precision, the motives of action, which were grounded only on caprice, accident, or error. As his fabrick is not founded in nature, he is perplexed by contradictions, which he finds irreconcileable with the principles of truth. Impelled, however, by a warm imagination, he bends every fact to his system, since he cannot rear his system upon facts. He descends from the character of judge: he becomes counsel for a party; and, like the ancient tyrant, tortures every circumstance to adapt it to his iron bed: where defective, he stretches it on the rack; and lops the superfluities, where it threatens to prove too much. Does a dynasty of kings stand in the way of a favourite hypothesis, he cuts them off at once: is there an unlucky chasm in the annals of a people, he makes a fresh creation: does an era gravel his new positions, he removes it back a thousand years; and mangles the chronology of half the world, to support a system of heterogeneous figments. Yet writers of ability will make even error

respectable. Though their systems are visionary, they are ingenious and informing. The researches after the Philosopher's stone, and Judicial Astrology, which engaged the learning and attention of the middle ages, were wild in themselves; as the objects were beyond the powers of man: yet Chymistry, Astronomy, and Navigation, owe much of their improvement to casual discoveries in those chimerical pursuits.[b]

The information we have hitherto received of the Ancient History, Mythology, and Manners of Eastern nations, has been almost entirely derived through the medium of the Grecian writers; whose elegance of taste, harmony of language, and fine arrangement of ideas, have captivated the imagination, misled the judgment, and stamped with the dignified title of history, the amusing excursions of fanciful romance. Too proud to consider surrounding nations, (if the Egyptians may be excepted) in any light but that of Barbarians; they despised their records, they altered their language, and framed too often their details, more to the prejudices of their fellow citizens, than to the standard of truth or probability. We have names of Persian kings, which a Persian could not pronounce; we have facts related they apparently never

knew; and we have cuſtoms aſcribed to them, which contradict every diſtinguiſhing characteriſtic of an Eaſtern people. The ſtory of Lyſimachus and one Greek hiſtorian, may indeed, with juſtice, be applied to many others. This prince, in the partition of Alexander's empire, became King of Thrace: he had been one of the moſt active of that conqueror's commanders; and was preſent at every event which deſerved the attention of hiſtory. A Grecian had written an account of the Perſian conqueſt; and he wiſhed to read it before the king. The monarch liſtened with equal attention and wonder: "All "this is very fine," ſays he, when the hiſtorian had finiſhed, "but where was I when "thoſe things were performed?" [c]

I MEAN not to aſſert that the hiſtorians of the Eaſt have not their failings as well as thoſe of the Weſt; but their facts, though clothed often in a luxuriance of diction, diſplay little of that national vanity, ſo conſpicuous in the moſt diſtinguiſhed of the Grecian writers, which leads to the invention and the embelliſhment of fiction. Whence they had their materials it is difficult to determine; but even the rudeſt of people, where they contradict not probability, are entitled to reſpect in the annals of their own country. In a few

circumſtances they coincide with the writers of Greece and Rome; this ſtrengthens hiſtory: there are many upon which they are ſilent; this naturally leads to doubt and enquiry: there are numbers in which the oppoſition is pointed: whom are we to believe? the natives, or the native enemies of a country? thoſe who might have had acceſs to genuine records, or thoſe who probably never could? [d]

It may undoubtedly be objected to the principal hiſtorians of Perſia, now known in Europe, that they are all ſubſequent to the Mohammedan era: that Perſian literature was almoſt entirely annihilated in the conſequences of the Arabian conqueſt: that the Grecians wrote nearer to the events which they have recorded; and therefore, though foreigners, have a ſuperior claim to our credence than the natives of after-ages, who muſt have compiled their annals under many circumſtances of diſcouraging obſcurity. Theſe conſiderations are undoubtedly of weight; and, in all relations where conſiſtency is not hurt, we ſhould certainly allow them every degree of force. It is error alone we ſhould wiſh to reprobate: it is the path of truth we ſhould wiſh to clear. [e]

The chief object of Hiſtory is to improve

the great ſyſtem of ſocial life, by inſtructing mankind in the experience of former ages. To anſwer this important end, it is by no means neceſſary that every fact we read ſhould be ſtrictly true in all its parts. The Cyropædia of Xenophon, or the Telemaque of Fenelon, may convey leſſons, on a variety of points, with an efficacy not inferior to the moſt unqueſtioned truths. Where no probability is therefore deſtroyed; no chronology obviouſly injured; no ſuperior authority evidently oppoſed: where the great lines are conſiſtent with the ſituation of the principal agents; and the conſequences ariſe naturally from the events: ſuch facts are entitled to our belief: and to queſtion them muſt only diſplay a very unneceſſary, and a very unpro-profitable ſcepticiſm. But, where the annals of one nation are tortured into co-incidence with the imaginary eras of another; where mighty details are given, the traces of which cannot be diſcovered in the countries moſt eminently intereſted; where ſober truth and rational evidence are ſacrificed to vanity, fiction, or exaggeration; ſuch narrations ſhould acquire no authority, becauſe tranſmitted by the moſt celebrated of the ancient writers, and copied by compilers of modern times. We ſhould look upon them as fables of mere

amusement; and proportion our admiration to their secondary merits alone; elegance of taste, ingenuity of invention, and excellence of stile.

When we reflect on the uncertainty of almost every thing merely human: when we observe the obscurity with which all history is involved in its beginnings: when we consider how few writers record the facts of their own observation; and the suspicious mediums thro' which they derive their knowledge: when we view the partiality of mankind for their country, their party, their opinions; with the necessity, which even the most enlightened, and the most unbiassed minds, have found of swimming with the stream of popular prejudice; we must candidly confess, that no particular class of historians have any solid claim to possess themselves exclusively of our belief; in opposition to others, whose narratives, tho' rational, are repugnant to those which we have been accustomed to receive. *Audi alteram partem* is an old and an excellent maxim; and impartiality ought ever to impress it on our minds, where opportunity furnishes the means. With channels of information, to which the ancients were completely strangers, how difficult is it even now to arrive at the true history of the simplest fact? and how wide of all resemblance does not the same

ſale appear, as told by the people under the oppoſite impreſſions of vanity, prejudice, or intereſt? How juſtly may we therefore ſuſpect the hiſtorians of every darker age, whoſe materials were defective, and whoſe imaginations were ſtrong: who lived at periods when impoſition was gainful, and credulity unbounded: where the neceſſary meaſures to ſecure the adoration of the Million to a Calf, a Cat, or a Beetle, furniſhed Prieſts (the great ſources of Egyptian and other ancient annals), with ſuch powerful incentives to the invention of the wildeſt and the moſt improbable of fictions.

TAKE many points of modern hiſtory, and all the information we receive is merely what each nation or party has written relative to public affairs: whilſt the events themſelves are ſtill ſurrounded with obſcurity and doubt. Read the Proteſtant Writers of France, and every circumſtance of horror marks the Maſſacre of St. Bartholomew's day: but turn to the Catholic page, and it becomes a neceſſary, a prudent, and a lawful act; the mere preventive of a ſimilar tragedy, meditated by the Admiral de Chatillon againſt the adherents of the Houſe of Guiſe. Take two foreign writers of our Engliſh hiſtory, over whom country and party prejudices ought to have had no influence; and how different is the

colouring of the ſame tale? With *Rapin*, the Caligulas and the Neros fall ſhort of the inhuman James, on the ſuppreſſion of Monmouth's inſurrection: whilſt the mild, the juſt, the forgiving prince is the portrait of the *Pere d'Orleans*. Contraſt the Memoires de Sully with the Libels of the League againſt Henry IV. or the Siecle de Louis Quatorze with the Invectives of the Proteſtant Refugees; and the Glorious Monarch, or the Savage Tyrant appear before you in ſucceſſive review. To enlarge upon the various opinions of our own writers, on the great events of Engliſh hiſtory, would be endleſs and unneceſſary: the circumſtances I have mentioned being merely intended to inculcate this ſimple poſition, That few facts, either of ancient or modern times, are ſo fully authenticated as to render farther enquiry improper. [h]

The Romans have read us many a leſſon on Punic faith: had we Punic writers, Mercileſs Jealouſy, and Perfidious Ambition, might, and perhaps with juſtice, have been retorted on the Romans. The Grecians have told us many a ſurpriſing tale of Eaſtern nations; it cannot be improperto liſten to what thoſe nations ſay. [i]

SECT. II.

A ſhort view of the early periods of Perſian hiſtory. Like thoſe of other nations disfigured by the marvellous; yet not entirely to be rejected. Diſagreement between the Grecian and Aſiatic hiſtory of Perſia. Invaſion of Xerxes improbable. Outlines of the Macedonian conqueſt from Perſian hiſtorians.

THE reigning families of Perſia, previous to the Arabian conqueſt, are comprehended, by their hiſtorians, under four dynaſties; the *Piſhdadians*, the *Kaianians*, the *Aſhkanians*, and the *Saſſanians*. The Perſians, like other people, have aſſumed the privilege of romancing on the early periods of ſociety. The firſt dynaſty is, in conſequence, embarraſſed by fabling. Their moſt ancient princes are chiefly celebrated for their victories over the Demons or Genii, called *Dives*; and ſome have reigns aſſigned to them of eight hundred, or a thouſand years. Amidſt ſuch fictions, however, there is apparently ſome truth. Thoſe monarchs probably did reign; though poetic fancy may have aſcribed to them ages

and adventures which the laws of nature reject. We diſpute not the exiſtence of our Engliſh Arthur, though we believe not in the Giants and Magic of *Geoffrey of Monmouth*: and Charlemagne was undoubtedly a great prince, though we ſubſcribe not to the wonderful adventures of *Turpin's Twelve Peers*. The Dives may have been ſavage neighbours, conquered by the Piſhdadian kings; and magnified by tradition as Beings of a ſupernatural ſpecies. The Gods, the Titans, and the Heroes of the Greeks; the Giants, the Savages, and the Monſters of Gothic romance, ſeem all to have originated from ſimilar principles: from that wild irregularity of fancy, and that admiration of the marvellous, which, in various degrees, runs thro' the legends of every darker period of the hiſtory of mankind. The longevity, at the ſame time, aſcribed to this race of monarchs, may either have been founded on ſome imperfect antediluvian idea; or may be reſolved, by ſuppoſing *families* inſtead of *individuals*: and that the *Caiumaras*, the *Ghemſhids*, and the *Feriduns* of the Eaſt, were merely ſucceſſions of princes, bearing one common ſurname; like the *Pharaohs*, the *Ptolemies*, or the *Cæſars* of the Weſt.

WITH the ſecond dynaſty, a more probable ſyſtem of hiſtory ſeems to commence: yet

ſtill the era of *Kaicobad*, the founder of this houſe, cannot be preciſely fixed. Though hiſtorians differ, however, with regard to the chronology of this prince; in one point, which may lead us to aſcertain it with tolerable accuracy, they appear, in general, to be unanimous. Darab the Younger, dethroned by Alexander, is called the ninth ſovereign of this line. He was aſſaſſinated about 300 years B.C. If thirty years are allowed therefore as the medium of each reign, or 270 for the nine kings, *Kaicobad*'s ſovereignty may poſſibly have commenced about 600 years before our era; which will comprehend the whole of that period of Perſian hiſtory for which we are indebted to the Greeks. Sir Iſaac Newton, it may be objected, with other chronologiſts, have allowed but twenty years to a reign, and made that the univerſal ſtandard for all nations: but, with ſubmiſſion to thoſe learned men, nothing carries with it a ſtronger tendency to unhinge all chronology than ſuch an unmodified ſyſtem. For if no collateral circumſtances of ſituation, manners, and government, are taken into the ſcale, much confuſion muſt apparently ariſe. From Zeno till the taking of Conſtantinople by the Turks, the Emperors of Greece reigned hardly fifteen years; and the Khalifs, from the death of

Mohammed till the ſacking of Baghdad by the Moguls, little more than ten years each. But, in thoſe and other countries, which have been remarked for a quick ſucceſſion of princes, revolutions and aſſaſſinations, it will always be obſerved, have ever diſturbed the courſe of nature: whilſt, in regular governments, the medium of reigns has been often lengthened to periods nearly approaching to what is above propoſed. From the murder of Henry IV. till the death of Louis XV. only three princes have filled the throne of France; making about fifty-five years to a reign: whilſt, in the diſtracted ſtate of that country, previous to Louis XIII. five kings ſcarcely completed twelve years each.—As the Perſian hiſtorians mention therefore no aſſaſſinations, nor uncommon convulſions of government; and as the adminiſtration of public affairs appears in general to have been fortunate and ſteady; thirty years, in thoſe ages, when at the ſame time a greater ſimplicity of life, perhaps, prevailed, ſeems to be a calculation by no means ſtretched beyond the probable line of nature.[b]

The *Kaianian* dynaſty being ſuppoſed then to commence nearly about 600 years before the birth of our Lord, this brings us to the reign of that king of the Medo Perſians, called by the Greeks *Cyaxares*; which, accord-

[library stamp]

ing to Sir Isaac Newton's conjecture, is suppposed to have begun in the year of Nabonassar 137 (about 610 before Christ) From this period till the Macedonian conquest, we have therefore the history of the Persians, as given us by the Greeks; and the history of the Persians, as written by themselves. Between those classes of writers, we might naturally expect some difference of facts; but we should as naturally look for a few great lines, which might mark some similarity of story: yet, from every research which I have had an opportunity to make, there seems to be nearly as much resemblance between the annals of England and Japan, as between the European and Asiatic relations of the same empire. The names and numbers of their kings have no analogy; and in regard to the most splendid facts of the Greek historians the Persians are entirely silent. We have no mention of the *Great Cyrus*, nor of any *king of Persia*, who, in the events of his reign, can apparently be forced into a similitude. We have no *Crœsus*, king of Lydia; not a syllable of *Cambyses* or of his frantic expedition against the Ethiopians. *Smerdis Magus*, and the succession of *Darius*, the son of *Hystaspes*, by the neighing of his horse, are to the *Persians* circumstances equally unknown as the numerous assassina-

tions recorded by the *Greeks*. Not a veſtige is, at the ſame time, to be diſcovered of the famous battles of *Marathon*, *Thermopylæ*, *Salamis*, *Platea*, or *Mycale*; nor of that prodigious force which Xerxes led out of the Perſian empire to overwhelm the ſtates of Greece. Minutely attentive as the Perſian hiſtorians are to their numerous wars with the kings of Turan or Scythia; and recording, with the ſame impartiality, whatever might tarniſh as well as aggrandize the reputation of their country; we can, with little pretence to reaſon, ſuppoſe, that they ſhould have been ſilent on events of ſuch magnitude; had any record remained of their exiſtence, or the fainteſt tradition commemorated their conſequences. Xerxes, according to Herodotus, croſſed the Helleſpont, attended by no fewer than 5,283,220 ſouls, and eſcaped back alone in a fiſhing boat; the whole almoſt of this mighty hoſt periſhing by the ſword, by famine, or by diſeaſe. The deſtruction of ſuch a number would have convulſed the whole of Aſia, had it been united under one empire: could it poſſibly have been unfelt in Perſia? Can any man who has made the leaſt obſervation, at the ſame time, on hiſtory, ſuppoſe, for a moment, that ſuch myriads could by any means have been maintained in one

collected body; even in the present times, when the art of war, in that particular department, has arrived at a degree of perfection unknown in those ruder ages. The greatest armies, of which we have any rational information, are those of Jengiz Khan and Tamerlane, the most despotic and the most powerful conquerors on record: yet these princes, in all their mighty atchievements, were seldom followed by 400,000 men. We are told, indeed, that the army of Tamerlane, on his return from the conquest of India; when he meditated the destruction of Bajazet, and of the sultans of Egypt and Baghdad, amounted to near 800,000 men, previous to the battles of Damascus and Ancyra. Yet those troops were dispersed in different divisions; they were besieging many distant places at the same period of time; and were not, after all, a sixth part of the reputed army of Xerxes: though Tamerlane possessed then an empire and an authority incomparably superior to that of the Persian monarchs in the highest zenith of their power; and was then marching against potentates of infinitely higher political consequence than the Grecians, at the supposed period of this tremendous invasion. But the states of Greece appear, in fact, with regard

to the Persians, to have been too far removed from that degree of importance which could hold them up as objects of such high ambition or of such mighty resentment. Till the reign of Philip of Macedon, they are hardly mentioned by the Persian writers, but as tributaries to the Persian empire. Those famous invasions may possibly therefore have been simply the movements of the governors of Asia Minor; to enforce a tribute, which the Persians might often claim, and the Greeks might never pay. Marathon, Salamis, and other celebrated battles may indeed have been real events; but "Numerous as the sands on the shore," is an idea which, in all times, has been annexed to defeated armies: and the Grecian writers, to dignify their country, may have turned the hyperbole into historic fact; and swelled the *Thousands* of the *Persian Satrap* into the *Millions* of the *Persian King*. [e]

Some of those famed events, it is not impossible too, might have been the mere descents of pirates or private adventurers; either with the view to plunder, or to retaliate some similar expedition of the Greeks; who appear very early to have been a race of free-booters extremely troublesome to the surrounding coasts. The Argonauts, if such heroes ever did exist, are not entitled to a more reputable

appellation: and indeed the practice ſeems to have been too univerſal to carry with the Greeks the remoteſt imputation of diſhonour. If we look into Homer, Thucydides, Diodorus, and others, we ſhall diſcover piracy to have been conſidered as a profeſſion; but without connecting with it the leaſt opprobrious idea. Strangers are careleſsly aſked whether they are traders or pirates; and the diſcovery of either character does not ſeem to heighten or diminiſh that reſpect or degree of hoſpitality which the manners of the times had annexed to the rank of thoſe roving gueſts. "Are you merchants bound to any port (ſays "Neſtor at Pylos to Telemachus and Mentor), or are you pirates, who roam the ſeas, "without a deſtined place; and live by plun-"der and deſolation?"—In this honourable profeſſion of pirates there may have been many ſubjects of the Perſian empire. Greece, as well as other countries, may have been often the theatre of their rapine and devaſtation: whilſt their ſucceſs or diſcomfiture muſt have been events of too little moment to reach the ears or engage the attention of the Shahinſhah, or King of Kings, at the remote cities of Perſepolis and Balkh. Suppoſe, if ſuch an illuſtration may be allowed, an Engliſh pirate to have landed in former times on Madagaſ-

car; suppose him to have called himself *King of England*; and suppose, after putting that island into a dreadful alarm, he had been at length defeated. The Madagascar historians, if any they had, to raise the glory of their nation, might compose a pompous detail of their Marathons and Platæas: they might repulse the English monarch at the head of any myriads the victors should vauntingly give out, or tradition magnify: and this might undoubtedly gain credit in Madagascar and in the adjacent isles; whilst the splendid event, unfelt, and even unknown to the British nation, found not a single line in their historic page. [d]

This celebrated expedition, amongst many Grecian narratives, equally suspicious, I have particularly selected; as the uncommon greatness of the enterprize, had it borne the least resemblance to truth, must have been too well known in Persia; and made too deep an impression upon the minds of each successive generation, ever to have been totally eradicated. I shall now proceed to trace the great lines of the only single fact of consequence, in which there appears even an irregular co-incidence; I mean the *Macedonian conquest*. The king who, according to Eastern writers, reigned in Persia immediately before the *Darius*

Codomannus of the Greeks, is called *Dara* or *Darab*. The firſt is ſynonymous with *Shah*, and ſignifies, in Perſian, *A king*. The other, in the ſame language, implies *Poſſeſſed by or found on water*; which name, they ſay, he obtained from the following circumſtance. The kings of Perſia appear to have aſſumed the privilege of marrying whom they pleaſed; and ſometimes made choice even of their own daughters. The Greek writers confirm the prevalence of this cuſtom; and obſerve, in particular, that Artaxerxes Mnemon eſpouſed two of his daughters, whom he had ſucceſſively promiſed to Tiribazus, one of his Satraps. Bahaman, the ſixth king of the Kaianian dynaſty, had married his daughter Homai, whom he left pregnant at his death; diſinheriting his ſon Saſſan, in favour of this lady and her offspring. Homai was declared heireſs of the empire, if not delivered of a ſon; and regent, in that event, till he was of age to reign. But averſe even to the diſtant proſpect of reſigning ſovereign power, the queen ordered the birth of her ſon to be concealed; and ſent him privately to be expoſed in a caſket on the banks of the Gihon. The riſing of the waters ſoon ſwept him away, and threw him on a dyer's bleaching ground. The rich ſtuffs and valuable jewels, which

the poor man found in the caſket, convinced him that he was a child of elevated birth. He educated him however as his own ſon; and wiſhed him to follow his profeſſion: but the prince, unwilling to believe himſelf the ſon of a dyer, urged his reputed father ſo ſtrongly, that the good man diſcovered at length all he knew; and delivered to him all the jewels which he had carefully preſerved. Young Darab determined immediately on the profeſſion of arms; and ſet out for the army, which was then marching againſt the Greeks. He arrived on the eve of a battle; in which he diſtinguiſhed himſelf with ſuch heroiſm, that his fame reached the queen. The prince was ſent for: Homai was ſtruck with his preſence: ſhe diſcovered him by the jewels, and the old man's teſtimony; and reſigned the diadem to him, after having reigned with great reputation about thirty years. This Darab is repeſented as an accompliſhed prince, and a ſucceſsful warrior. Philip of Macedon, amongſt others, according to Khondemir, drew upon him his reſentment, by refuſing to acknowledge his authority. He marched againſt him; and forcing him to take refuge in a fortreſs, Philip ſued for peace; which was granted, on condition of giving his daughter in marriage to the Perſian king, and pay-

ing an annual tribute of a thousand *Beizets*, or eggs of gold. The young queen did not please her royal consort. Tho' pregnant, he returned her to her father's court; where she was afterwards delivered of the famous Alexander, whom Philip educated *as his son*; and left him his kingdom, with the secret of his birth. Darab having, in the mean time, espoused another lady, she brought him Darab the Younger; who mounted the throne on the demise of his father. This prince is represented by the historians of the East in very different colours from the gentle and amiable Darius Codomannus. His cruelties and oppressions rendered him so detested in Persia, that the great lords exhorted Alexander to assert his right to the empire. Encouraged by those general discontents, he resolved upon the attempt; and, as a leading step, informed the ambassadors of Darab, when demanding the tribute of the golden eggs, "That the bird "who laid them had flown to the other "world." This refusal, with the raillery which accompanied it, enraged the king of Persia. He marched immediately, to reduce the Macedonian to obedience. The monarchs met: a bloody battle ensued: and Darab was worsted. He retired to his tent, to take some repose before renewing the engagement;

but was ſtabbed by two of his attendants, who fled immediately to the Grecian camp. Alexander, informed of the murder, haſtened to Darab's pavilion. He found him in the agonies of death: he threw himſelf on his knees, wept, and proteſted his ignorance of the treaſon. The dying prince believed him; named him his ſucceſſor; gave him his daughter Roſhana in marriage; requeſted him to revenge his aſſaſſination; to govern Perſia by Perſian nobles; and expired in his arms. Alexander, they add; chiefly by the counſels of Ariſtotle, whom they call his vizir, punctually fulfilled theſe laſt injunctions of the dying king: the great men of Perſia being appointed to the government of the provinces and dependent kingdoms; which they were permitted to hold on the feudal principles of homage, ſubſidies, and military ſervice, to the conqueror, as Paramount Sovereign of the empire.[9]

Here is a detail which correſponds with the writers of Greece and Rome in nothing but the cataſtrophe: and yet, in the whole annals of Perſia there is not, perhaps, a ſingle paſſage which boaſts a more intimate agreement. A ſingular incongruity! How ſhall we reconcile it? And to whom muſt we lean? The Grecians are already in full poſ-

ſeſſion of our imaginations: we imbibe a reverence for them in our early years, which it is impoſſible ever to eradicate; and we are dragged with difficulty to give a candid review to accounts, which, though fully within the line of probability, contradict ideas which we have ſo long foſtered with care. Yet were relations, ſo widely diſtinct, equally new: were *China* and *Tartary* ſubſtituted for *Perſia* and *Greece*: were hiſtories of their wars preſented to our peruſal by the reſpective hiſtorians of thoſe people; and did we perceive nothing in the name, in the atchievements, or the chronology of the principal actors, which could poſſibly be forced into a conſiſtency, or perſuade us that we were reading the ſame events in which both countries were ſo importantly intereſted; what perplexity muſt accompany our opinion? Should we not naturally conclude, that both had related many fictions, and perhaps ſome truths? Should we not weigh the apparent authority of their materials; conſider who approached neareſt to national vanity, prejudice, and pride; and decide at length for thoſe writers, who, tho' liable to much miſtake, appeared not, in ſo high a degree, to have the ſame inducements to the commemoration of wilful error? This I mean, however, in reſpect to the general

idea: for, in many circumſtances of the above relation, I ſhould certainly incline to the Greeks: but more from a ſtrong collateral preſumptive evidence, than any ſuperior dependence upon their hiſtorians: I allude to Demoſthenes. Philip appears, from the orations of this great man, to have been too much engaged in the uniting or enſlaving of the Greeks not to have ſhunned, till that great object was accompliſhed, every circumſtance which might embroil him with Perſia. Whilſt, had he ever been defeated by that nation, and obliged, in conſequence, to ſubmit to tribute, it muſt have not only too much weakened that power, with which he at length ſubjected the ſtates of Greece, but furniſhed facts too important to have been omitted in the Philippics.[f]

SECT. III.

The Greek language cultivated in the East. All the ancient Persian books not destroyed by the Arabians. Observations on Oriental Tradition, Pride of blood and Genealogy. Historians greatly patronized in the East. Asiatic histories numerous. The Greek historians neglected in the East. Probable reasons for this neglect.

THERE is one circumstance, amongst many others, which, in the course of my reflections on the disagreement of the Persian and Greek historians, has ever struck me with much force. The language of Greece was early cultivated in the East: the connexions of the Persians and Arabians with the successors of Alexander in Syria and Egypt, were long and intimate. Before the era of Mohammed, it was considered as a branch of polite, and even of mercantile education. Greek slaves were common in Arabia; the receipts and disbursements of the treasury of

the Khalifs were written in that tongue for ſeveral generations after the Prophet's death. The coins of the Khalifat were invariably ſtruck with Greek inſcriptions, till the reign of Abdomelic in 695: and the Perſian coins of the Aſhcanian kings, commonly called Parthians or Arſacidæ by Europeans, had alſo Greek inſcriptions, which were probably introduced by Alexander or his ſucceſſors. Many of the Mohammedan princes gave great encouragement to tranſlations from the Greek; particularly of the proſe writers. That the Grecian hiſtories muſt have conſequently been known, eſpecially to their learned ſubjects, cannot, I think, with reaſon, be called in queſtion. Shall we ſuppoſe then, that Oriental annaliſts would not have made great uſe of thoſe writers, had their narratives been in the leaſt degree conſonant to the hiſtories and traditions which the Perſians themſelves conſidered as authentic? That all Perſian books were not deſtroyed by the Arabians, is certain. Some, which concerned not the religion of the Magi, fell into the hands of thoſe who admired and preſerved them. The *Zefer namé*, a dialogue on government and morality between Nouſhirvan the Juſt, king of Perſia, and his vizir Bouzour, has been already mentioned. In the preface to a copy of Firdouſi's

Shah namé, we are informed, that a book of hiſtory was diſcovered, during the general havoc, by Saad, one of the Mohammedan generals, and carefully preſerved by him; as containing nothing repugnant to the tenets of the Alcoran: and M. D'Herbelot obſerves, that it was from a collection of Ancient Perſian Hiſtorians, in the old dialect, that Firdouſi drew materials for his immortal work. The kings and great men of the Eaſt have long rivalled one another in nothing more than in the excellence of their libraries. With incredible attention and expence, they ſtored them with every valuable manuſcript they could poſſibly procure; and whatever unrelenting ſeverity a vanquiſhed prince might, by Eaſtern cuſtom, experience from his more fortunate competitor, his books appear to have been ever an object of uncommon care.

EXCLUSIVE of ſuch Perſian authors as eſcaped the Arabian proſcription, with other records, of which our imperfect knowledge of their language, and ſlender intercourſe with their country, has hitherto deprived us of any poſitive intelligence; one ground of preſumptive information ought not to be wholly diſregarded; I mean Tradition. What are the relations of ancient Egypt? What are the early annals of Babylonia, of Greece, of Rome?

Except the ſacred writings, what, in a word, is every ſpecies of hiſtory a little way beyond 2000 years? Mere Tradition! and much of it of the moſt doubtful and improbable complexion: the Traditions of Pagan prieſts, whoſe importance reſted on the invention and propagation of error. If any dependence then is placed on thoſe Weſtern tales, in the abſence of more convincing evidence, candour ought to allow a proportionable degree of weight to thoſe of the Eaſt. In all countries where any difficulty, from whatever cauſe, has been found in the regiſtering of public events, Tradition has ever been obſerved to flouriſh with ſuperior ſtrength; and, through the medium of marvellous embelliſhment, preſents us often with the great lines of the atchievements of former times. Where the written memorials of a people are few, and where fewer ſtill can read them; he who rehearſes a rude poem, or a romantic tale, is looked up to with reſpect. Whatever exalts men above their peers, will ever be cultivated with care; and ſons will often endeavour to excel in what had raiſed their fathers to diſtinction. The prevalence of tradition, in the darker ages of Europe, is unqueſtioned. The Bards, the Scalds, and the Minſtrels, were careſſed by the fierceſt warriors of thoſe bar-

barian times. Their older compositions are generally considered as the real actions of ancient chiefs: fiction prevailed not so much till later ages: it was the offspring of refinement; and refinement led the way to the downfal of oral record. For when learning became more diffused; when feudal lords considered it as no disgrace to sign their names; when written language became disseminated thro' various orders, and many could read the history of those deeds which formerly had been confined to the knowledge of a peculiar order of men; their songs wanted novelty; they were no longer sought after; their profession fell into contempt; and at length was gragually extinguished.

A VARIETY of circumstances, peculiar to Asia, justifies us in supposing, that tradition was more vigorous in the East than even in the West. In Persia, India, Tartary, Arabia, from the earliest of times, it has been one of their favourite amusements to assemble, in the serene evenings, around their tents; on the platforms with which their houses are in general roofed; or in large halls erected for the purpose; in order to amuse themselves in various exercises of genius; and frequently in traditional narratives of the most distinguished actions of their remoter ancestors. Oriental

imagery might often indeed embellifh their tales; but, like the Gierufalemme of Taffo, or the Lufiade of Camoens, the embroidery of the imagination would not entirely conceal the ground-work of truth. Much rational information will therefore be difcovered, not only in their more ferious traditions, but alfo amidft the amufing wildnefs of their romantic fables. Even in the Arabian Nights Entertainments, and other Eaftern tales, though we may find no neceffity to believe in Aladdin's lamp, in the Genie Danhafh, or the Fairy Peri banou; we fhall, neverthelefs, difcover a truer picture of Eaftern manners and beliefs, than in all the Grecian writers; or in hundreds of other books, more generally reforted to as authorities. The havoc even made amongft the Perfian records, with the oppreffion under which they groaned during the three firft centuries of Arabian fubjection, might have united more intimately their men of knowledge; rendered their meetings more frequent, and their traditions more interefting; from an apprehenfion that they would drop into oblivion, if not ftrongly and repeatedly impreffed upon the memories of the rifing generation. That many events may have been in this manner preferved in rude poems and legendary tales, like the Runic fragments of

the North, the Romanzes of Spain, or the Heroic Ballads of our own country, ſeems to be highly probable; as well as that ſuch materials may have originally ſuggeſted to Firdouſi many of the adventures in his *Shah namé*: which, like Homer, when ſtript of the machinery of ſupernatural beings, is ſuppoſed to contain much true hiſtory, and a moſt undoubted picture of the ſuperſtition and manners of the times. Profeſſed ſtory-tellers, it may alſo be obſerved, are of early date in the Eaſt. Even at this day, men of rank have generally one or more, male or female, amongſt their attendants, who amuſe them and their women, when melancholy, vexed, or indiſpoſed; and they are generally employed to lull them aſleep. Many of their tales are highly amuſing, eſpecially thoſe of Perſian origin, or ſuch as have been written on their model. They were even thought ſo dangerous by Mohammed, that he expreſsly prohibited them in the Alcoran. The following is given as the reaſon: An Arabian merchant, called Naſſer ben Hareth, having reſided long in Perſia, returned to his own country whilſt the prophet was publiſhing his Alcoran. Naſſer having, perhaps, paid conſtant attendance at the meetings above alluded to, had treaſured up a number of ſtories relative to the famous Asfendiar,

Roſtam, and other ancient heroes of Perſia. Theſe he related to his countrymen: they thought them excellent: the legends of the Alcoran were even neglected; and they plainly told Mohammed, when rehearſing ſome verſes he pretended to have juſt received from heaven, that the Perſian tales were far ſuperior to his. This alarmed him: and he immediately produced part of a chapter, as ſent by the Angel Gabriel, declaring them to be impious and pernicious fables, hateful to God and to his prophet: a cenſure which inſtantly and long checked their currency with all true believers in the new religion. [e]

Another circumſtance, which muſt have greatly contributed to the preſervation of written and traditional hiſtory in the Eaſt, is *Pride of Blood*; upon which their great men value themſelves far beyond the proudeſt European grandee. Genealogy has conſequently long been cultivated with ſingular attention; and the following, amongſt other reaſons, may be aſſigned for it. The deſultory form of government, which has in general prevailed in Aſia, has ſeldom left any ſecurity but the ſword for the poſſeſſion of power. Reverſes of fortune have, in conſequence, been frequent and ſudden; and it has been no uncommon object to behold a man riſing to

ſovereignty, whoſe father had been in the meaneſt condition of mankind. Yet this abject creature might poſſibly have been deſcended from ſome ancient dynaſty of kings, whom a ſimilar revolution had driven from their throne. The moſt powerful and moſt favoured nobles would naturally, at the ſame time, ſhare the fate of their prince. Some obſcure corner or diſtant country might give them refuge; where a regard for perſonal ſafety, and the proſpect of a new revolution, would induce them to conceal, under a mean diſguiſe, the royalty or nobleneſs of their origin. This gave an extenſive range to claims of ſuperior Birth; and whether real or imaginary, they were conſidered as points of too much conſequence to be neglected by a new monarch, a ſucceſsful general, or a riſing ſtateſman. Every ſpecies of evidence was therefore anxiouſly ſought for; and the ſkilful in genealogy were encouraged with a liberality that had nothing European in it. Innumerable proofs might be brought: I ſhall mention a few. [d]

Ardeshir, ſurnamed Babegan, who (A. D. 202.) wreſted the ſceptre from Ardeban, the laſt king of the Aſhkanian dynaſty, was the ſon of a ſhepherd, who kept the ſheep of one Babeg, and married his daughter. No ſooner however was he fixed upon the throne,

than, with the aſſiſtance of genealogiſts, he proved his deſcent from Saſſan, the diſinherited ſon of Bahaman.—Saman, the founder of the dynaſty of the Samanides, who reigned in Tranſoxania from the year 873 to 997, was the ſon of a camel-driver; and for ſome time followed the ſame profeſſion: but his poſterity brought their genealogy from Behram Joubin, (deſcended from a family that had reigned at Rei) who uſurped, for ſome time, the throne of Perſia towards the end of the ſixth century.—Abou Mohammed Obeidallah, the firſt of the Fatemite dynaſty in Africa, (who afterwards conquered Egypt, where they reigned as Khalifs) had been a lockſmith at Emeſſa in Syria. But this trade he abandoned, and ſet up for a prophet; in which he was ſo ſucceſsful, that he ſoon, by the help of his followers, raiſed himſelf to ſovereign power: and pretended to be deſcended from the Khalif Ali and Fatemah, Mohammed's daughter. The Khalifs of Baghdad, part of whoſe dominions he had uſurped, publiſhed ſeveral manifeſtos againſt him and his ſucceſſors; in which the fallacy of their pretenſions were expoſed. But they ſtill aſſerted their claim; and, upon this ground, ſupported their right to the Khalifat, as the only true Imams, or heads of the Mohammedan religion.—Buiah, the

father of Amaduddowla, the firſt Perſian monarch of the Deylemite race, was a fiſherman; but his ſon, when he aſſumed the diadem, (A. D. 932.) traced the family to Behram Gur, who reigned in the middle of the fourth century.—Seljuk, the founder of the Seljukian dynaſty of Turks, claimed kindred to Afraſiab, an ancient king of Turan or Scythia, who makes a conſpicuous figure in the early period of Perſian hiſtory.—One of the firſt cares of Tamerlane was to aſcertain his relationſhip to Jengiz Khan: farther it was unneceſſary to go; for that conqueror, in the meridian of his greatneſs, had carried up a regular pedigree to Turk, the ſon of Japhet.—Iſmael Sefi, the firſt king of the late reigning family of Perſia, who, after defeating the princes of the White Ram, mounted the throne about the year 1502, traced alſo his genealogy to Ali and Fatemah.—It muſt be unneceſſary to multiply examples: inferior men were equally ambitious of high deſcent: whilſt it may not be unworthy of remark, that the whole idea appears to have originated more from faſhion or a natural impulſe of the mind, than any conſideration of ſtate policy: for we by no means find that the people of Aſia have ever diſtinguiſhed themſelves for attachment to royal blood; having ſubmitted

in general with equal facility to ſovereign power, whether adminiſtred by the ſon of a prince or the ſon of a peaſant. [e]

SUCH having been the ruling paſſion in the Eaſt for illuſtrious deſcent, it is hardly neceſſary to obſerve, that Genealogy is a ſtudy ſo intimately connected with Hiſtorical knowledge, that it is impoſſible to arrive at any proficiency in the one, without being minutely verſed in the other: but particularly on the preſent ground; where appeals to the eras and actions of diſtinguiſhed men, through whom it would be neceſſary to connect the chain of evidence, muſt have required a very critical acquaintance with chronology and public facts: to avoid obvious contradictions, and give an air of plauſible accuracy to pedigrees, which, in many caſes, muſt have been more ſpecious than ſolid. [f]

THE ſame elevation of ſentiment, we may alſo obſerve, which inſpired thoſe high ideas of ſuperior birth, led naturally to a wiſh for future fame. To add to the glory of a family line was a favourite object. Hiſtorians and poets were, of conſequence, often in the train of a ſucceſsful conqueror. They were witneſſes of the events they were to deliver down to future times; and they were neither expected to exaggerate or invent. The riches

and honours conferred therefore on men of genius, has nothing ſimilar in our weſtern world: whilſt the freedom of their ſtrictures, and the manlineſs of their moral leſſons, will hardly be conceived by thoſe who have been accuſtomed to annex to Eaſtern minds the feelings alone of ſervility and terror. We have, in conſequence, particular hiſtories, not only of almoſt every Eaſtern Dynaſty, and of every diſtinguiſhed prince, but of the principal countries and cities of Aſia; and moſt of them written with ſuch an apparent adherence to truth and impartiality, that they are almoſt conſtantly preferred to European writers, by our modern hiſtorians of the Cruzades, and other Eaſtern events of the middle ages.

THE royal and noble authors of Aſia are, at the ſame time, numberleſs: a catalogue alone would fill a volume. I ſhall here only take notice of the Vizir *Nezam ul mulk*; as a ſmall manuſcript of that great man's will furniſh me with ſeveral facts relative to Eaſtern manners. Nezam roſe from a private ſtation in the eleventh century, to be Vizir to the Sultan Alp Arſlan and his ſon Malek-ſhah Jelaleddin: which high office he held till near ninety years of age; when he was ſtabbed by a Bataniſt, one of the ſubjects of the Old Man of the Mountain; whilſt he

was reading a petition which the aſſaſſin had preſented. This Vizir was one of the moſt extraordinary men of any age or country. He was a complete ſtateſman and a conſummate general. He was learned: and a moſt munificent patron of learning. He founded and endowed many ſeminaries of ſcience, but particularly a noble college at Baghdad. His palace was ever open to men of genius; many of whom enjoyed great penſions from his private purſe. They looked upon themſelves as his ſubjects and children; and uſually attended their benefactor, on great ſolemnities, from every quarter of the empire. [h]

FROM the foregoing obſervations, which might be ſwelled by many authorities, I apprehend it will appear ſufficiently evident, that the Perſians and other Aſiatics have been remarkably attentive to the annals of their country: that their materials for ancient hiſtory are upon a footing of reſpect not inferior to thoſe of more Weſtern nations: that their traditions are upon a ground as ſubſtantial as thoſe of the Greeks, the Egyptians, and other people of high antiquity: and that the ambition of royal and noble deſcent, more conſpicuous in Aſia than even in the more Weſtern regions, muſt have been productive of much

research, and opened uncommon channels for genealogical and historical investigation. [1]

WHEH we strengthen this chain of facts and probabilities, by considering how high in favour physicians and other learned Greeks were at the courts of almost every Mohammedan prince; when we consider the number of merchants and other travellers in perpetual motion between the East and West; when we consider the frequent embassies; the alliances by marriage; the familiarity of conversation which appears to have been supported with an ease wherein interpreters had evidently no concern: and when we add to the whole, the singular attachment of the princes of the East to almost every species of learning, whilst Constantinople was the theatre of every barbarity that could degrade human nature: the presumption is much stronger, that the Asiatics spoke Greek, than that the Grecians spoke Arabic or Persian. As every ground of reason seems to lead us therefore to conclude, that the Greek tongue was, for many centuries, known in the East, nearly as well perhaps as it is now in Europe; we must extinguish all curiosity in man, and contradict every characteristic disposition of human nature, if we suppose that the Grecian accounts of Ancient Asia should have remained, for so

many ages, wholly unknown to the men of erudition, who wrote; or to the men of rank, who patronized them. Hiſtory is one of the first objects which engages the attention, when dipping into a foreign tongue. Sovereigns and miniſters of ſtate muſt ever, above all men, be intereſted in knowing what ſtrangers ſay relative to their own or neighbouring kingdoms. The Khalif *Almamoun*, in particular, was a prince of extenſive erudition, and unbounded curioſity. He could not well be indifferent with regard to what the ancients might ſay relative to Babylonia, his royal reſidence and ſeat of government. He had ordered, without reſtriction, a general collection of Greek authors to be made for the purpoſe of tranſlation; and it is impoſſible to ſuppoſe that Hiſtorians could be excepted. They muſt have been ſubmitted, amongſt the reſt, to the review of the learned: their ſubject would naturally be reported to the Khalif; and if not tranſlated, it could apparently ariſe only from the conſideration, that their hiſtory of thoſe countries ſeemed merely the Tale of a Tub ſeriouſly told; and by no means agreeable to the belief either of the aborigines of the country, or of the ingenious men of all nations, who, from every quarter of the empire, flocked to Baghdad, as the centre of magnificence and ſcience. When

we reflect then, that the Mohammedan writers have paid no regard to the Grecian histories: that they have given us facts of a very different complexion: that no historian will ever presume to publish annals of his own country, totally dissimilar to the great lines of ancestorial atchievement, which must ever remain strongly impressed upon the minds of a people; and that those histories of Persia are considered as genuine by the Asiatics in general: no observation on the manners of mankind can justify a total disregard to them; though dissonant to the relations which we have hitherto been accustomed to receive. Modern compilers of Ancient History may wish indeed to conceal their ignorance of the languages and literature of the East under one general unsupported assertion, That they are wild, uninteresting, and obscure; but such a mode of indiscriminate censure can tend only to perpetuate error. Truth ought to be searched for wherever it can be found; and a well authenticated fact, if told by a Persian, an Arab, or a Chinese, should remove an improbability, though adorned with all the eloquence of Greece or Rome.

It will not be conceived, however, that I wish any ancient story exploded but upon grounds of obvious propriety. A free and

candid investigation is all that is proposed. Even the most impossible and most absurd of the Grecian and Roman fables may keep their ground, till more rational and well supported facts appear to fill their room. Any thing is better than a vacuum. Geographers of unknown regions, according to the poet, place in their maps "Elephants instead of towns:" and there can be no harm in allowing the Elephantine legends of Old Greece still to amuse our leisure hours: but if a town is at length discovered, the Elephant should surely change his station. *Semiramis*, the *Argonauts*, *Sesostris*, and half the marvellous tales of early times, are all Elephants: but as they would leave a mighty blank in those high ages of fable, they may still continue to fill their respective niches; like Bacchus, and Venus, and Hercules, and Ceres. But I cannot help thinking, that it is refining rather too much upon the credulity of man, to fix, like the great Newton, the precise epochas of those Pagan Gods and Heroes: introducing even eclipses, and other astronomical observations; to demonstrate the eras and adventures of beings, whose existence stands upon a ground by no means more substantial than the Garagantua of Rablais, or the Brobdiggnaggs of Lemuel Gulliver. "I do not pretend, says

"Sir Isaac, (in the eighth page of his Chro-
"nology), to be exact to a year: there may
"be errors of five or ten years, and sometimes
"twenty, and not much above." This publication, indeed, bearing the name of the immortal Newton, though highly built upon by subsequent chronologers, is so unspeakably inferior to that great man's other works, that I am almost unwilling to believe its authenticity; and can hardly be persuaded he ever would have published it himself. The materials of which it is composed were probably mere memoranda, committed to paper in the intervals of relaxation from more abstracted studies. He could not but perceive contradictions and impossibilities in the ancient historians, and in the systems of those who had framed chronologies from their data. Something he might have meditated, and something we might have had, of authority similar to his higher demonstrations; had he lived to have sent it into the world, completely considered, and finished with that penetrating discernment, which so remarkably distinguished his philosophical investigations. But this remains to be regretted. Posthumous publications are always to be suspected; and many a great man's fame has felt most cruel stabs

from the avidity of the public for even the gleanings of superior genius, and the undiscerning zeal of some surviving friends.

SECT. IV.

Contradictions in Greek Historians and Chronologers. Queen Semiramis. The Argonautic expedition. Sesostris.

LET us now take a slight view of the consistency of the Greek writers, and the more modern chronologers, with regard to a few of the famous personages and events of antiquity, and then candidly determine the justice of their claim to unlimited belief and authority.—Queen *Semiramis*, according to Ctesias, lived about 2280 Before Christ: Helvicus says 2248: Syncellus 2177: Petavius 2060: Eusebius 1984: Dr. Jackson 1964: Archbishop Usher 1215, Philobiblius (from Sanconiathon) 1200: Sir Isaac Newton 760: Herodotus 713: and D'Herbelot, supposing her to have been the Persian queen Homai, grandmother to Darab II. (Darius Codomannus), brings her down within four hundred

years of our era. Diodorus, Strabo, Suidas, Arrian, and others, differ alſo in various degrees: whilſt the actions they aſcribe to her are as monſtrous and impoſſible, as the diſagreement of their reſpective eras. [a]

THE *Argonautic Expedition* has, by many learned men, been conſidered as a fact ſo unqueſtionable, that it has become a kind of grand era for aſcertaining the more doubtful dates of many ſubſequent events. Sir Iſaac Newton, by calculations of the retrograde motion of the Equinoctial and Solſtitial points, called the Colures, from their ſuppoſed place then, till the year 1690, fixes this expedition about the year 937 before Chriſt, grounded chiefly upon a ſuppoſition, that the *Greek Sphere* was invented by two of the Argonauts *Chiron* and *Muſæus*; who delineated the expedition, under the name of *Argo*, amongſt the Aſteriſms. But this ſeems to be a fundamental error into which this great man has fallen, even in his own line. Canopus, the chief ſtar of Argo, is only 37 degrees from the ſouth pole: the greateſt part of the conſtellation is ſtill nearer to it. The courſe of the ſuppoſed voyage from Greece to Colchis lies between 39 and 45 degrees of north latitude. A few only of the leſſer ſtars can poſſibly be ſeen in the whole track: whilſt thoſe of the firſt magni-

tude, and which alone are deserving of notice in every astronomical observation, are, in those parts, totally invisible. But had this sphere been constructed by the Argonauts; and had they wished to commemorate the enterprize by placing their ship amongst the stars; they must apparently have chosen a constellation which was conspicuous in Greece; and not one, the visible stars of which were too minute to attract attention, or to be of the least use in the direction of their navigation. But in fact the very foundation of this astronomical question has no basis: we have no previous demonstration of the era of Chiron and Musæus, or even of their existence. The invention of the sphere, rude as it confessedly was, and by no means a solid ground for exact calculation, is at the same time assigned to many who were not Argonauts: and their pretensions seem equally substantial. Diodorus ascribes it to Atlas; some attribute it to Palamedes; others to Nausicaa, the daughter of king Alcinous; and many deny it to have been *even of Grecian origin*, but to have come from Egypt. Granting therefore that the equinoxial colure actually passed through the middle of Aries, when that sphere was constructed, no argument can possibly be drawn from thence to fix the Argonautic expedition,

any more than the building of the pyramids, till it has been firſt of all ſhown that the Argonauts were the inventors. [b]

Let us next conſider the Argonauts in point of number, their courſe, their atchievements, and the time employed in the expedition. *Fifty-one* is the higheſt amount: ſome make them only *forty-four*. Yet theſe heroes, beſides many other important feats, attack Laomedon and take Troy; they build cities and temples in various diſtant countries, which half a million could neither have erected nor peopled; and return to Greece in *four months*, or, according to ſome, in *two*. The courſe they ſteer is equally full of contradiction. On their return from Colchis, they found, it is ſaid, Ætes, the king of that country, whoſe fleece and daughter they had ſtolen, prepared with a fleet to diſpute their paſſage through the Boſphorus of Thrace. Declining an engagement, they ſtruck acroſs the Euxine, and ſailed up the Danube, the Don, or ſome other river, through Northern Europe, into the Baltic; and thence returned, by the Mediterranean, to Greece. Some conduct them from the Danube to the Po or the Rhone; and others, by the ſouthern ocean, through Lybia. Another claſs traces them over the great continent of Aſia into the Indian ocean,

the Red Sea, and the Nile; dragging their Argo all the way over mountains, or carrying it on their ſhoulders, where they could not conveniently ſail. It is unneceſſary to dwell upon the more minute deviations. Some make Jaſon the commander, others inſiſt for Hercules; and even the place of deſtination is varied from Colchis on the Euxine, to the extremity of the Indian coaſt. Diodorus, to give the whole an air of probability, contradicts in many reſpects, every prior account, and makes them return through the Helleſpont; leaving all their famous buildings, to which he himſelf, nevertheleſs, frequently alludes, to be reconciled to an agreement with this route by the reader or any ſubſequent hiſtorian. It would be endleſs to enlarge upon the various impoſſibilities of this celebrated enterprize: and indeed the accounts given by Diodorus, Strabo, and other later writers, were there no other inconſiſtency, ſeem at once to be a complete refutation of the whole. They ſaw the incongruity of their predeceſſors: abſurdities and contradictions in almoſt every line could not well eſcape their penetration. They went therefore upon a different plan. They took part of one, part of another, threw in conjecture with a liberal hand; and formed from the whole an hypotheſis, which might

give an author some slight air at least of consistency with himself. Their tales are more plausible; yet still they are but tales: we cannot call them facts. Such however has been the system apparently adopted by every subsequent chronologer and compiler. Diodorus appears to have been the model. We have, in consequence, ancient events, not as they really happened, but as it was thought they should have happened. In their hands early history has acquired, in some respects, the superficial appearance of probability: but as much may be said for Pharamond or Cassandra; and Oroondates, Arsaces, and the Fair Barsina, may throw in their claim to be realized, and to have their eras ascertained, with equal pretensions to reason as Hercules, Jason, or Medea. [c]

To launch upon the ocean of chronology would require a separate and an extensive treatise. It may only be proper here to observe, that all the eminent men in this line have split upon the Rock of System. A favourite hypothesis being once adopted, they bend every thing to a co-incidence. Sir John Marsham and Sir Isaac Newton, for example, fancy a similitude between *Shishak* king of Egypt and *Sesostris*, whose being and period of existence is as doubtful as Semiramis.

The fabulous Sesostris conquered half the world; but the Shishak of Scripture only plundered Jerusalem and returned. All the resemblance that can be discerned is, that they are both said to have been kings of Egypt; and that they had both great armies: yet to force them into a point of contact, Sesostris is brought down some hundreds of years from the station where ancient historians had placed him; and circumstances totally dissimilar are racked into a most unsatisfactory proof of their similitude. But, with less violence, Charlemagne and Louis XIV. might be made the same person. They were both kings of France; both were powerful princes; and both possessed, to a very high degree, the thirst of extensive conquest, and the consequent luxury of making mankind wretched.

SECT. V.

The Chronology of the Sacred Writings perplexed by endeavouring to reconcile it with that of the Greeks. An attempt to adjust the Seventy years Captivity. Building on Eastern proper names, unsupported by facts, the rock on which Chronologers have split.

THE endeavours of commentators to reconcile all the events of ancients times to the history of the Greeks, have by no means been confined to pagan annals. The chronology of the Sacred Writing has, in many points, without the appearance of necessity, been forced into an analogy with their imaginary eras: in consequence of which, a variety of anachronisms have been introduced, which are in direct opposition to the *Historical Books of Scripture*, to the *Jewish Chronicles*, to *Josephus*, and to all observation on the longevity of man. I shall attempt to clear up one event, submitting, with much deference, the solidity of my conjectures to men of deeper research and superior abilities. The

Grecians have given us the hiſtory of a Perſian King, called Κῦρος, which we tranſlate *Cyrus*. *Iſaiah* prophecies, that a prince named כורש *Coreſh* will releaſe the *Jews* from captivity, and order the rebuilding of the temple. To reconcile theſe two princes, has been conſidered as an object of high importance; and much learning has been employed to embarraſs a much more ſimple and ſatisfactory chronology. The Jewiſh larger chronicle, and Joſephus, finiſh the building of the temple only about *thirty-four* years before the fall of the Perſian empire: the Samaritan interruptions had protracted the completion of the work near *twenty* years: the Macedonian conqueſt took place about the year 331; to which, if we add the *fifty-four* years abovementioned, the proclamation of *Coreſh* muſt have been iſſued about the year 385. But the *death of Cyrus* is placed, by the concurrence of our chronologers, in 529, or 144 years before this period: he therefore could not be the prince alluded to by Iſaiah. As a confirmation of the probability of the Jewiſh dates, Joſephus mentions expreſsly, that Sanballat, the Samaritan governor, who had given ſo much interruption to the building of the temple, *was alive in the time of Alexander*; which is extremely poſſible by the above chro-

nology: but by the common ſyſtem, he muſt then have exceeded 200 years of age. *Jaddua* was the High Prieſt who met Alexander on his return from the ſiege of Tyre, in the year 332. Now by the Sacred Writings we find, that *Jaddua* was the fifth in ſucceſſion from *Jeſhua*, who, together with *Zorobabel*, conducted home the captive Jews. This event, if connected with the *Grecian Cyrus*, muſt have been in the year 536, or 204 years before the above-mentioned meeting; which happened in the *ſeventh* year of *Jaddua*'s prieſthood. As *Jeſhua* was probably advanced in age, when commiſſioned with *Zorobabel* to lead the captive people home, *ſeventeen* years may be a full allowance for his dignity, ſubſequent to that period; which leaves *forty-five* years each to the other four; a term far beyond all calculation and probability: eſpecially as the Jewiſh high prieſthood was remarkable for a very quick ſucceſſion. The opinion and records of the Jews, when fixing the chronology of the building of this temple, an event which muſt have made ſo powerful an impreſſion upon the minds of the whole nation, ought indeed to have been deciſive; where no oppoſition eſpecially was found to the Canonical Books. But for no reaſon that can apparently be diſcovered, excepting to

force the *Coresh* of *Isaiah* to be the *Cyrus* of the *Greeks*, have our commentators laboured to involve a plainer narrative in darkness; and to create with many a doubt of the whole, because there appeared irreconcileable contradictions in the parts.*

As an attachment to the chronology of Greece seems to have led therefore to many unnecessary liberties with Scripture, it cannot be improper to observe, how far the historians of Asia correspond with the Sacred Writings. Those kingdoms, known to us by the names of the *Assyrians*, *Medes*, and *Babylonians*, appear, from the Eastern writers, to have formed early one great empire; subject to the kings of Persia, on a tenure nearly resembling the feudal system. The principal of those dependent principalities seems to have been Babylon; which, during the reign of Lohorasb, was governed by a prince called *Nabocodnassar*, *Nakhtunassar*, and *Bakhtunassar*; who is described as having pushed his conquests far into the West: and particularly, *to have over-run Judea, and made captives of the inhabitants.* His son and successor is painted as a brutal tyrant; whose oppression of the Jews drew upon him the resentment of Ardeshir Dirazdest, king of Persia; who removed him from the government, and ap-

pointed in his room *Coresh*, a prince of the blood, grandson of Lohorasb. The mother of this prince, they add, was a Jewess; and this they give as one reason for the warmth with which he espoused the cause of that people: to whom he gave permission to return to Jerusalem, with every encouragement towards the *rebuilding of the temple.* Now let us observe the chronology, and we shall find a remarkable concurrence. Darab II. is said, by the Persian historians, to have reigned *fourteen* years: Darab I. *twelve*; and queen Homai *thirty*; whose immediate predecessor, as before observed, was Ardeshir. If we place then the issuing of the proclamation *two* years before Ardeshir's death, this brings it to the year 388, B. C. a difference of only *three* years from the Jewish dates; and of small consequence in such remote transactions. Ardeshir reigned long: let us suppose *thirty-eight* years before the proclamation of *Coresh*; add about *thirty* more for the reign of Kishtasb; and the commencement of the *Seventy years captivity* will be placed in the end of the reign of Lohorasb, by whose orders, Nabocodnassar, as before observed, conquered Syria, Palestine, and other Western districts. [b]

The great lines coinciding thus, in a manner so singular, I shall proceed to observations

on the ſeeming diſagreement of ſome inferior points. It appears evident, both from Daniel and the Perſian hiſtorians, that *Goreſh* or *Cyrus* acted a ſubordinate part in the taking of Babylon; the name of his ſuperior, being, according to the Sacred Writers, *Darius the Mede*; but, according to the Perſians, *Ardeſhir*, called alſo *Bahaman*. No etymological ingenuity, it is certain, can diſcover a reſemblance between thoſe names.: but that does not ſeem to be of the ſmalleſt conſequence. The great rock, as obſerved above, upon which our chronologers have uniformly ſplit, is an attention to the fancied ſimilitude of names; and to this they have often ſacrificed every conſiſtency of fact: But nothing can offer a more unſubſtantial baſis. It has been long a cuſtom in the Eaſt for the reigning ſovereign to give his ſon ſome important government, with the title of king; and this name he generally changed when he ſucceeded to his father. The ſon and ſucceſſor of Shapor II. in the fourth century, was called *Kermanſhâh*, and by European writers *Carmaſât*; but when he mounted the throne of Perſia he aſſumed the name of *Babaram*. Jengiz Khan, in the early part of life, was called *Temujin*. Many of the Great Moguls have bore different names before their acceſſion. Similar inſtances are

innumerable. It was alſo common in Greece: Plato was originally named Ariſto. That an alteration of names prevailed greatly in old times, we have even remarkable proofs in the Paralipomena books of Scripture. When *Eſther* was ſelected amongſt other virgins for the royal choice, her former name *Hadaſſah* was dropt; and a new one given to her, ſignifying, in Perſian, *A Star*. When *Daniel*, *Hananiah*, *Miſhael*, and *Azariah*, were choſen to attend the king, their names were changed to *Belteſhezzar*, *Shadrach*, *Meſhach*, and *Abednego*. All nations, we may alſo obſerve, have had a greater or leſs partiality for metonymical and metaphorical alluſions: and many perſonages have been often deſcribed by ſome peculiar attribute, or title; which was perfectly well underſtood by thoſe to whom the ſpeech or writing was addreſſed, though by no means obvious to others without a key. In the Sacred Writings, a hiſtory of the Perſian empire is not intended: ſuch points only are touched upon, as are connected with the annals of the Jews: to be intelligible to the choſen people is all that was propoſed: the name, the title, or the epithet of the ſovereign of Perſia, which was moſt familiar to *them*, was conſequently choſen: and whether it was the *King*, the *Great King*, *Darius*, or

any corresponding denomination, it was certainly a point of no importance, whilst they all were perfectly understood. *Dara*, as observed before, signifies, in Persian, a *Great King*; and the addition of *Median* might simply denote that his chief residence was in that country. The different Persian monarchs of the Kaianian dynasty, had a partiality for different cities in their extensive empire. Lohorasb was so remarkably fond of *Balkh* in Khorassan, that he is often called *Balkhi*. His successor Kishtasb gave the preference to *Istakhar* or *Persepolis*. Bahaman might have lived occasionally in *Media*; and possibly have marched from thence, attended by *Coresh*, on the expedition against Babylon. Queen Homai was particularly attached to *Persepolis*; where the Asiatic historians say she built the celebrated palace which they name Chehelminar, afterwards destroyed by Alexander: and, as this became the favourite abode of her successors till the Macedonian conquest, we accordingly find that every subsequent event, mentioned in the Sacred Writings, is referred to the time of *Darius the Persian*; tho' comprehending a period far beyond the reign of that prince: a circumstance which has induced Sir Isaac Newton to suppose *Darius the Persian* to include *Darius Nothus* as

well as *Darius Codomannus*: a theory by no means ſatisfactory, as it will not account for the ſilence of Scripture with regard to the intermediate princes, *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, *Artaxerxes Ochus*, and *Arogus*. The whole endeavours of the learned, indeed, to reconcile the *Perſian Kings of Scripture* to the *Perſian Kings of the Greeks*, appear only to be productive of embarraſſment: but if the theory now propoſed is found to be juſt, Of conſidering many of the Scripture names as mere royal titles, it will correſpond perfectly with the ſublime figurative language of the Sacred Writers, and pave the way for removing ſeveral perplexing difficulties. The only Babyloniſh and Perſian princes found in the Bible are *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Evil Merodach*, *Balſhazzar*, *Ahaſuerus*, *Darius the Mede*, *Coreſh*, and *Darius the Perſian*: *Artaxerxes* is alſo mentioned in *Nehemiah*. The firſt Babyloniſh prince correſponds exactly in name, era, and actions with the Perſian hiſtorians. The next two are not named by them; being only, in general, conſidered as governors or feudatory princes under the Great King: and the others, I apprehend, are ſimply epithets, given indiſcriminately to any of the Perſian monarchs, like *Cæſar*, or *Czar* in Europe. *Ahaſuerus* or *Achaſuerus* has, in particular,

been the subject of much etymological investigation. Sir Isaac Newton, by inadvertency, makes him, in one place, to be *Cyaxares*, and, in another, *Xerxes*. Archbishop Usher supposes him to be *Darius Hystaspes*; Scaliger, *Xerxes*; Josephus, the Septuagint, and Dr. Hyde, *Artaxerxes Longimanus*. Now each of these conjectures contradicts the other; and none of them co-incide with the common chronology of the Bible, excepting Usher. Four different princes are named; and a range is taken of 187 years: the reign of the first, according to Newton, commencing 611 years, and the last dying 424, before Christ. [c]

As such disagreements, amongst our most learned men, show clearly, that the basis must be wrong, there can be no impropriety in adding one conjecture more; which is, That *Ahasuerus*, like *Darius*, is not the name of any individual prince, but a title; and probably derived, by a very simple Persian etymology, from *Chosru*; which signifies a *Great King*. *Chosru* or *Kai Chosru* was the third prince of the Kaianian dynasty; whose successful wars against the Turanians or Scythians, the old hereditary enemies of Persia, had greatly extended and firmly established the empire. His reputation was high in Asia: he was almost adored by his subjects, and by after-genera-

tions. The names of diſtinguiſhed men in the Eaſt, have frequently been aſſumed as titles by ſucceeding princes; and they have been often given to them by foreign nations, whether they aſſumed them or not. Many kings of the Aſhkanian and Saſſanian dynaſties bore the name of this ancient Perſian monarch, by way of adjunct or ſurname, as *Choſru Parviz*, *Choſru Nuſhirvan*: and the Romans gave the name of *Coſroes* to almoſt every ſovereign of the Saſſanian race. That foreigners might, in older times, have done the ſame with reſpect to the Kaianian princes, is entirely conſiſtent with probability. And upon this ground we ſhall obviate another difficulty, with regard to *Ahaſuerus*, which ſeems difficult to be reconciled on other principles; and furniſhes, at the ſame time, a ſtrong preſumptive argument in ſupport of the preſent theory. We find an *Ahaſuerus* in *Eſther*, and an *Ahaſuerus* in *Ezra*. Now according to the common Scripture and Greek chronology, theſe cannot be the ſame individual prince. The marriage of the firſt with Eſther is placed about the year 515 before Chriſt. *Cyrus*, as before obſerved, died in 529; and *Darius Hyſtaſpes*, ſucceeding Smerdis Magus in 521, reigned till 485. But in *Ezra* we find the ſucceſſion to be *Cyrus*,

Darius, and *Ahasuerus*. This last prince must have reigned therefore after *Darius*, not earlier than 485; and could not reign likewise, cotemporary with him, in 515. Should the advocates for archbishop Usher's idea even insist, that, notwithstanding this passage, there was still but one *Ahasuerus*, and that *Ahasuerus* was *Darius*; for the sake of argument, it might be granted, without weakening the hypothesis: as it would then demonstrate, that the same prince is called in the Bible both *Darius* and *Ahasuerus*; and that they were consequently both royal titles, and indiscriminately used. It may perhaps be said, that if these were royal titles, the prefixing of *Melech*, or any similar word, implying a sovereign, as *King Darius*, or *King Ahasuerus*, would be a tautological redundancy. But that would be an objection of no weight, nothing being more common in the East: a famous prince in the eleventh century, amongst many instances, being called *Sultan Malek Shah*, which literally signifies *King King King*.

The apparent conclusions to be drawn from the preceding observations, are, That the Greeks and Romans in their ancient histories, especially of distant countries, are often wrong; and, in general, liable to suspicion:

That their accounts of the East, as well with regard to manners, as historic facts, are inconsistent with the Asiatic authors; irreconcileable with Scripture; contradictory in themselves; and often impossible in nature: That as the later writers, Diodorus, Strabo, Plutarch, are often in complete opposition to the earlier historians, and complain of the repugnances with which they are every where perplexed, nothing can more strongly point to a fundamental error: That modern chronologers, commentators, and compilers of Ancient History, differ likewise greatly in opinion; supporting frequently their systems by points of a most doubtful complexion, and rejecting others of a far more probable appearance: That a resemblance of names is often preferred to a consistency in facts: That the inventions of superstition, or the fictions of poets, are often viewed as real events; and the same critical accuracy employed in fixing the early epochs of imaginary beings, as in resolving the most rational truths of more authentic times. That such being the uncertain basis of Ancient Story, no materials ought to be despised: That the Persian and Arabian historians are intitled to attention, in whatever regards their own countries; their relations being grounded at least on national belief;

and national belief never originating without ſome foundation: That the mere priority in time of the Weſtern to the Eaſtern writers, when unſupported by circumſtances of higher evidence, ſhould give no preference in regard to authority: as, upon the ſame principles, we might rank a *Cteſias* before *Plutarch*; a *Roger de Hoveden* before *Hume*; or a *Gregory* of *Tours* before *De Thou*: That we may perceive ſome ſtrong lines of truth in the Eaſtern hiſtorians, from their concurrence with the Bible, in the few facts mentioned above: whilſt even their ſilence on ſome heads, with their ſlight variation in others, furniſh high preſumption of their authenticity: for had they been exactly in conformity with the Scripture, we ſhould naturally have concluded, that their materials had been borrowed from thence; and conſidered them merely in the light of tranſlations. But the manner in which they are told ſhows, that the great lines were independently known in Perſia; and that the difference is ſimply what might have been expected between Sacred Writers, who had every opportunity of information; and the annaliſts of another country, who neither had ſuch advantages, nor were ſo deeply intereſted in the events.

The usefulness of the Arabic language, in the illustration of Scripture, has indeed long been generally acknowledged; whilst the Persian, little studied by the learned, has hardly ever been considered as an auxiliary in this important point. Yet when we reflect upon the intimate connection of a great part of the history of the Jews with that of Persia, it is difficult to account for this singular inattention, upon any ground but the supposition, That the old dialect of Persia is lost; and that the modern can give no assistance in remote enquiries. But this, as I have before observed, seems to be a surmise, unsupported by the slightest authority: the pure Persian now in use being evidently of very high antiquity; and apparently the chief language in which any thing Persian, worth preservation or recovery, has been written by the ancient natives; however it may have been disguised under a variety of perplexing characters, which few have given themselves the trouble to consider with attention. Should the Arabic and Persian languages ever become therefore, like the Greek and Latin, objects of general education; and learned men, freed from the fetters of prejudice, be once brought to suppose, that Grecian and Roman information may *sometimes* be assisted or corrected by

a judicious study of Eastern authors, many discoveries must evidently be expected; which may furnish a variety of useful clues to the dark labyrinths of Ancient Mythology, History, and Manners. [f]

SECT. VI.

Usefulness of the Arabic and Persian languages in throwing light on early times. Strictures on Mr. Bryant's New System or Analysis of Ancient Mythology.

AMONGST other learned men who, apparently from an idea of their modern date, have disputed the utility of the Arabic and Persian languages, in the investigation of remote antiquity, is the ingenious author of *A New System or Analysis of Ancient Mythology*; a work in which the novel ingenuity of the Analytic System; the penetration and judgment displayed in the refutation of vulgar errors; with the new and informing light in which he has placed a variety of ancient facts; leaves the learned world only to regret,

that this classical writer had not, to his singular knowledge in Greek and Roman literature, added some tincture of the languages and learning of the East. As there appears, however, to be an impropriety in any person's condemning what he confessedly does not understand; and as this learned gentleman has attacked a province, which I conceive it is my duty to defend; I shall endeavour to remove some of the prejudices which he may have created: as the errors of a writer of uncommon abilities, who has laid down canons for future history, may have a more dangerous tendency than the mistakes of inferior men, whom few read, and still fewer follow. [a]

The chief points, which Mr. Bryant means to establish, are, *First*, The universality of the Deluge from Gentile authorities. *Secondly*, The migration, after the Babel dispersion, of a people whom he calls *Cuthites* or *Amonians*, the descendants of *Chus* the son of *Ham*. *Thirdly*, The Arkite ceremonials, with the general worship of the Sun and Fire, as introduced by those people into the different countries where they established colonies. [b]

'Two great lines, our learned author observes, marked, in particular, the Amonian character; The monuments and rites which they every where instituted, as memorials of

the Universal Deluge; and The proofs they every where left of their idolatrous worship of the Sun and Fire. With regard to the first great event, I shall only observe, in general, that the departing from the Sacred Writings, to prove the destruction of mankind by Pagan authorities, however laudable the intention, seems first to shake to the foundations the venerable fabrick, and then to prop it with a bullrush. For, where recourse is had to feeble and imperfect evidence, a cause must ever be hurt in proportion to its failure. Yet, as if truth wanted the aid of fiction, innumerable have been the attempts of the learned to establish, by forced and unnatural construction, a conformity between the early history of the Hebrews and the later fables of Greece, Egypt, and other ancient nations. From the fragments of Berosus, Sanconiathon, Manetho, and other remote fablers, any thing, and every thing, may indeed be drawn, which a lively imagination can suggest; but the working up of such strange materials into any circumstance descriptive of Noah's Deluge, shews a warmth of fancy, highly prepared for the reception of every thing marvellous. Whilst, giving them all their utmost force, they prove, at last, precisely nothing: for ingenious men, if resolved to apply to profane materials in

support of Scripture, ought to go to mountainous districts, and to countries far removed from the possibility of natural inundations: they ought to consider Hindostan, and other quarters of the world, where they positively refuse to believe this important event. Testimonies from such regions would be far more conclusive than hundreds of volumes from Egypt and Chaldea. The periodical overflowings of the Nile, it is easy to imagine, might have proved fatal to the first inhabitants of Egypt, till experience had taught them to guard against its inundations; whilst the terror naturally filling the minds of rude men, who, with difficulty, had escaped a deluge in which their dearest friends had perished, might easily give rise to ten times more superstitious rites than ever investigation has discovered in ancient Egypt. The same arguments will hold with equal force, in regard to the still darker glimmerings from Babylonia; where mounds, canals, and all the efforts of the ruling powers for thousands of years, have not been able to prevent the sudden desolation which the Euphrates and Tigris have often spread around. To advance, in short, as proofs of an Universal Deluge, such ceremonies as the processions of Egyptian priests, with a boat and a strange figure, ap-

pears to be equally unsatisfactory, as the demonstration of a general destruction by fire would have been, from observations on the environs of Mounts Vesuvius or Ætna.[c]

The next point, in relation to the Cuthite or Amonian worship of the Sun and Fire, I shall consider with more attention; as the strongest arguments seem naturally to spring from the subject, to demonstrate the usefulness of the Arabic and Persian languages, in relation to the history and mythology of ancient times; and show convincingly, at the same time, that the most intimate acquaintance with the literature of Greece and Rome will lead the greatest critical acumen but a little way without such assistance. To make the subsequent observations more intelligible, it will be proper to give two extracts from the learned author's preface, which will fully show the ground-work of his ingenious hypothesis.
"It is necessary for me to acquaint the reader, "that the wonderful people, to whom I allude, were the descendants of Chus; and "called Cuthites and Cuseans. They stood "their ground at the general migration of families: but were at last scattered over the "face of the earth. They were the first "apostates from the truth; yet great in "worldly wisdom. They introduced, where-

"ever they came, many useful arts; and "were looked up to, as a superior order of "beings: hence they were stiled, Heroes, "Dæmons, Heliadæ, Macarians. They were "joined in their expeditions by other nations; "especially by the collateral branches of their "family, the Mizraim, Caphtorim, and the "sons of Canaan. These were all of the "line of Ham, who was held, by his poste-"rity, in the highest veneration. They call-"ed him Amon: and having, in process of "time, raised him to a divinity, they wor-"shipped him as the sun: and from this "worship they were stiled Amonians."—— "Most ancient names, not only of places but "of persons, have a manifest analogy; there is "likewise a great correspondence to be ob-"served in terms of science, and in the titles "which were, of old, bestowed upon magis-"trates and rulers. The same observation "may be extended even to plants and mine-"rals, as well as to animals, especially to "those which were esteemed at all sacred; "their names seem to be composed of the "same or similar elements, and bear a mani-"fest relation to the religion in use among "the Amonians, and to the deity whom they "adored. This deity was the sun; and most "of the ancient names will be found to be

"an aſſemblage of titles beſtowed upon that "luminary. In conſequence of this, I have "ventured to give a liſt of ſome Amonian "terms, which occur in the mythology of "Greece and in the hiſtories of other nations. "Moſt ancient names ſeem to have been "compoſed out of theſe elements; and into "the ſame principles they may be again re-"ſolved by an eaſy and fair evolution. I ſub-"join to theſe a ſhort interpretation, and, at "the ſame time, produce different examples "of names and titles, which are thus com-"pounded. From hence the reader will ſee "plainly my method of analyſis, and the ba-"ſis of my etymological enquiries." [d]

Thus has this learned gentleman created a people to fill up every chaſm of high antiquity, and to account for all the phenomena of early population, hiſtory, and ſuperſtition. As the Sacred Writings, however, afford no lights to trace the wanderings of this extraordinary family; and as all his gleanings from profane tradition might with equal force, in the ſame ingenious hands, prove Confucius to be William the Conqueror; his ſubſtantial proofs, in my apprehenſion, amount to nothing: the great weight of his evidence reſting chiefly on the ground of etymological deduction. Such being the ſtation he has choſen to con-

trovert the ſyſtems of all preceding writers, and to fix the principles of all ſucceeding hiſtory, it could have been wiſhed, that the moſt unqueſtioned ſtrength had marked his fundamental axioms; that the definitions of his elementary particles had been preciſely fixed; that the languages, whence he has drawn the meanings he has annexed, had been diſtinctly ſpecified; and that not a doubt ſhould have been left upon the reader's mind with regard to the great baſis upon which his fabrick ſtands. But on this leading point, aſſertion ſeems too often to have uſurped the province of proof: of above forty radicals, a half at leaſt do not appear to approach the ſenſes he has given them: whilſt, miſled by his ear and his eye, he has fancied analogies, which the languages will not bear; and drawn concluſions, to which the premiſes ſeem completely foreign.

One great endeavour of our learned author is to trace to his Cuthites the origin of Solar and Igneous worſhip: and, in order to fix this theorem, he brings forward a number of particles, which, he ſays, in ancient times ſignified the *Sun* or *Fire*. But as he ſeldom mentions in what particular language they were recived in thoſe ſenſes, doubts naturally ariſe. To the Sun, as a mere aſtronomical

body, or to the Fire, as a simple element; few of them appear to bear the most remote relation: and, in any other sense, descriptive of them as objects of adoration, they might, with equal propriety, be adduced to authenticate the worship of the Egyptian Onion, the Druids Oak, or the great Arabian Stone Devil in the valley of Mouna. For how far they may have been figuratively applied, will prove only the traces of *general* superstition; without pointing either to the nature, origin, or votaries of any *particular* mode of worship: because *great*, *glorious*, and such epithets, which some of those words imply, may have been indiscriminately bestowed upon every stock or stone, which the folly of man has, at any time, thought proper to treat with respect. [f]

The first of those particles which I shall take notice of, is *el* or *al*. In Hebrew, Arabic, and Persian, this word has many different meanings; and, amongst others, signifies *a god*: but without the least authority to suppose that it ever had any particular affinity to the Sun. In a variety of instances, however, it is merely the Arabic article *the*; as *Elain* The fountain, *Elaur* The Fire, *Ain al shain* The fountain of Syria, *El said* The Prince; &c. "The deity *El*, Mr. Bryant

"says, was particularly invoked by the Eastern nations, when they made an attack in "battle: at such time they used to cry out "*El-el* and *Al-al*. This Mohammed could "not bring his proselytes to leave off, and "therefore changed it to *Allah*." But this appears to have no foundation, and the learned gentleman produces no proof. I have not been able to discover, that the Arabians ever entertained the least partiality for *El*, as a divinity: nor is the name even to be found amongst the numerous idols worshipped by the different tribes: a circumstance extremely improbable, had it ever been remarkable as an object of their invocation. *Allah*, on the contrary, is a word of much antiquity; and was certainly in use among the Arabians long before the era of Mohammed. I shall mention one unquestionable authority. The prince Amralkeis, a cotemporary of Mohammed, was one of the most celebrated of the Arabian poets; and the author of one of the famous poems, formerly mentioned, called *Moallakat*; which, on account of their superior excellence, were hung up in the temple of Mecca. In this poem, *Allah* occurs; where it never could have appeared, had it been an innovation of Mohammed. Two reasons seem to be conclusive; *first*, The rooted aver-

sion and contempt that prince ever entertained for the prophet and his religion, which would have made him despise the idea of adopting any thing originating from him: and, *secondly*, The certainty that this poem must have been written, and suspended in the Kaaba, before Mohammed's public appearance; or at least before he had obtained influence sufficient with the Arabians, to make them depart from established usages: for after he had got that Temple into his power, we find no more poems hung up there. To have admitted any thing indeed into that sacred fabric, which supported not the new religion, would have been considered as a high profanation: and we cannot surely suppose, that the productions of a professed pagan, a personal enemy to the prophet, and an open scoffer at the Moslem faith, should have met with that favour which was denied from this period to all the world. Another proof that *Allah* was of old used for Omnipotence amongst the Arabians, may be drawn from the following circumstances. The chief religion that prevailed in this country, before the Mohammedan, was the Sabian: which inculcated a belief in one Supreme Deity; in the stars and angels, as his subordinates; and in idols, as their representatives. Of those idols the principal was *Allat*, or *Ali*-

lat (the feminine of Allah), whom they considered as the eldeſt daughter of God; and worſhipped, in that character, with the higheſt degree of devotion. If the Arabians had therefore any ſpecies of war-cry before their prophet's era, it was probably either *Allah*, which they uſe ſtill, or *Allat*, their favourite goddeſs: both of which are derived from a root wholly diſſimilar to *El*. Was any further argument neceſſary, to prove that this was no introduction of the Arabian lawgiver, the ſilence of the Alcoran would alone, perhaps, be ſufficient: for had this cry ever prevailed, and had it ever been conſidered as an object of alteration by Mohammed, it muſt have been mentioned in that book: there being no point to which the prophet was more ſtrictly attentive than to introduce into it, by the pretended miniſtry of the angel Gabriel, every innovation, however trifling, which he judged proper to make, in the religion, laws and manners of his countrymen: in order to gain reſpect, and ſecure obedience to his mandates; which, by this device, he perſuaded his followers, were the immediate dictates of heaven.*

On, or *eon*, is ſaid to be an Egyptian name of the Sun; and for this we have the authority of the prieſt Manetho, as quoted by Euſebius and Theophilus. I ſhall not diſpute it;

but only obſerve, that every thing relative to the old Egyptians is ſo ſtrangely involved in hieroglyphic darkneſs and abſurdity, that we know little, which bears the ſemblance of probability, with regard to their hiſtory, their religion, or their language. The kahens, or prieſts, it appears, had a myſterious character of their own; and as every expreſſion of common ſenſe ſeems to have been conſidered by them as dangerous to their power, by removing the barrier of ſuperſtition from between them and the people; ſymbols, which meant any thing and nothing, were uſed as the only medium of religious communication. The rude and hideous hieroglyphics on their obeliſks, have no analogy to thoſe of any people in the world; nor has any enquiry fixed the moſt remote reſemblance between their ſacred dialect and that of any adjacent ſtate. To build therefore Syrian, Chaldean, or Phrygian rites, dignities, and cities, on Egyptian etymologies, appears, at beſt, a moſt ſuſpicious ground; and certainly very unfit to bear a ſuperſtructure of any magnitude. [b]

THE etymological combinations and derivatives from *Ham*, the ſon of the patriarch Noah, and the ſuppoſed progenitor of the Cuthite family, are introduced, in a variety of lights, as great authorities in ſupport of the

existence of this uncommon people; and of the adoration of the Sun and Fire, which they are ſaid to have ſo univerſally propagated. But on this head I have many doubts. *Ham*, in the Hebrew, as well as in the Arabic, is ſpelt with a letter, the true pronunciation of which is a ſtrong aſpiration, reſembling *h* in *Hound*. Wherever Europeans have therefore written it *Cham*, it muſt apparently have proceeded either from inadvertency, or to accommodate it to a ſimilar ſound in their own languages. The Germans and Dutch, in particular, will ever adopt this mode, becauſe they univerſally give *ch* a ſtrong guttural pronunciation; but in Engliſh and other languages it ſeems to be wrong; as this Eaſtern word can never, with propriety, be pronounced like *Character*; but preciſely as *Hound* above-mentioned, or as *Ham*, the manner in which it has been uniformly and judiciouſly expreſſed by the tranſlators of our Engliſh Bible. The combinations, in which hard *Ch* or *C* is introduced, appear, for theſe reaſons, to have no natural concern with the name of the patriarch; and muſt, if they have any meaning, be looked for in various and very diſtinct roots: though chance and corruption may poſſibly, after all, lay a ſtronger claim to the far greater number, than the moſt ingenious

analyſis can trace to a more legitimate origin. It may be ſaid indeed, and with truth, that ſome nations have univerſally given the hard ſound of *ch* to this letter; the Italians in particular writing and pronouncing Mohammed *Machomète*. But this is evidently a corruption: corruptions are not uniform. Perſians, Syrians, Greeks, indeed all nations, corrupt differently. Yet Mr. Bryant brings names from China to Rome, beginning with hard *C* and *Ch*: and all of them, he ſays, derived from *Ham*; but till it can be demonſtrated, that theſe various nations, diſſimilar in almoſt every point of view, are, nevertheleſs, uniform in their mode of corrupting foreign words, we ſhall hardly be induced to believe, that thoſe names challenge an origin from one common radical word. — *Amon* or *Omanus*, and ſimilar names which he alſo deduces from *Ham*, ſeem, if poſſible, to be ſtill more vague. The Hebrew and the Arabic differ remarkably in their formation from moſt other tongues. In theſe the alphabets are divided into certain letters, which they call *radicals*, and *ſerviles*. The firſt are as eſſential to the texture of a word, as the head is to the human body; and excepting in poſition, muſt ever remain unaltered; conjugation, declenſion, with every ſpecies of inflexion, derivation and compoſi-

ſion, being performed by the intermediation of the ſerviles. As theſe are placed not only at the beginning and end of words, but alſo in the middle, the radicals are conſequently often ſeparated; and they are ſometimes tranſpoſed: but to omit any of thoſe indiſpenſible letters, or to add a radical to a root already complete, is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the genius of the tongues; and wholly deſtructive of the words; as either depriving them altogether of ſenſe, or giving them meanings incompatible with the intrinſic ſignifications of their themes. Now the initial *h* in *Ham* is a radical letter: to remove it, is preciſely removing the whole word; *Amon*, on thoſe principles, can apparently have no reference to the ſon of Noah; and every concluſion drawn from the *Amonian* appellative of the Cuthite people, ſeems to be a foundation by far too ſlight to ſupport the edifice, which the learned gentleman has erected upon it.

Ait, we are next told, is the *Sun*; but ſtill without mentioning in what dialect. *Ait*, in Hebrew and Arabic, ſignifies a *ſign*, *wonder*, *miracle*, &c. and in this ſenſe *Ait-el* (which, according to Mr. Bryant, implies *Deus Sol*) may be rendered The *wonderful God*; and *Ait-ur*, The *miraculous fire*, inſtead of The *fire* or *heat of the Sun*. *Athyr*, one of the old

Egyptian months, of Chaldean extraction, which he derives from this combination, ſeems to come from a different origin; and may perhaps be the ſame with the Perſian *Azyr* or *azer*, which ſignifies *Fire*, *lightning*, *the Angel of fire*; and alſo a month, which correſponded anciently with March, and now with November. That the Chaldeans and Perſians had many words in common, is unqueſtionable; whilſt the difference of pronunciation is nothing but what is uſual in every word where ſuch letters are found; the Jews, the Arabians, and probably the Egyptians, giving often the hard ſound *t'h*, *dh*, *ds*, &c. to thoſe characters, which the Perſians ſoften into *z* or *s*.[k]

As, *is*, or *ees*, is alſo ſaid to be the *Sun*. In Hebrew, *as* undoubtedly denotes *Fire*; and may, poſſibly, have been figuratively applied to the Star of Day: I ſhall here confine my obſervations therefore to ſome miſtakes into which Mr. Bryant has been apparently led by a ſimilarity of ſounds. "*As*, he ſays, is "ſometimes compounded with itſelf, and ren-"dered *aſas* and *azaz*;" and thence he draws a variety of concluſions, as if the combinations from *aſas* or *aſis*, and *azaz* or *aziz*, were deducible from the ſame original: but Cicero and Scanderbeg are not more diſtinct than

the roots from whence they ſpring; the firſt implying, in Hebrew, as before obſerved, *Fire*; and, in Arabic, *A foundation*, *origin*, *firſt principle*; the other denoting *Glory*, *dignity*, *power*, &c: whilſt the initial letters are, at the ſame time, not only quite different, but *s* and *z*, however interchangeable ſometimes in other languages, (as patronize, patroniſe; authorize, authoriſe, in Engliſh), are equally remote, in the Eaſtern dialects, from promiſcuous uſe, as the moſt oppoſite ſounding characters in the alphabet. *Ateſh*, Fire, it may alſo be remarked, can never poſſibly be derived from *ad-is*. the radicals being totally irreconcileable; an objection that indeed may be made to the names of almoſt all the countries, temples, lakes, and fountains; which, by combination, tranſpoſition, and fancied analogy, he lays down, as originating from *as* or *az*.[4]

San, *ſon*, *zan*, *zaan*, Mr. Bryant ſays, was the moſt common name for the Sun; but in what Eaſtern dialect we are not informed. Upon this ground, he obſerves, however, that the Indian *Hercules*, or the Greek *Dorſanes*, was an abridgement of *Adorſan*; which he interprets *Lord of light*: but we have no proof that *ador* ever ſignified a *Lord*, or *ſan* the *Sun* or *Light*. *Ador* may be tranſlated, in Arabic,

The power of fire: but I would rather ſuppoſe it to be the ſame as the Perſian *Azer* (Fire) mentioned above; for, by the difference of pointing, or provincial pronunciation, it may be ſounded *azor*, *azer*, *azyr*, *ador*, &c. *San*, when ſubjoined to nouns in the Perſian language, implies *ſimilitude*; *Adorſan* or *Azerſan* may ſignify therefore *reſembling fire*, *ſplendid*, *bright*: and, conſequently, it may, with propriety, have been applied as an epithet or attribute to a deity. *Barſanes*, an ancient king of Armenia, is alſo ſaid to denote *Barſan*, or *offspring of the Sun*; yet ſtill as we diſpute *ſan*'s relation to the ſun, it is impoſſible to admit it. *Bar*, as an adjunct, denotes *a country*, as Malabar, Tranquebar, &c. it alſo implies *great*, *elevated*; and, in that ſenſe, is often joined with the name of God: *San* ſignifies *dignity*, *grandeur*, *honour*, &c. A combination of ſuch terms may naturally furniſh good etymological grounds for religious or royal titles, without any relation to the ſun; but I will go a little farther, and juſt hint, that *Barſan* may be corrupted from *Barzan* or *Berzin*, which in Perſian denotes *Fire*, *a temple of fire*, *a chief prieſt of fire*; and abſolutely the name of the reputed founder of the firſt temple of fire in Armenia: in which country, by Grecian as well as Eaſtern tradition, this

BOMBAY BR. ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
mode of worſhip is ſaid to have originated; and to have been carried from thence by Zoroaſter into Perſia. As the king was often, at the ſame time, high prieſt, the propoſed etymology may not, perhaps, be altogether ideal.[m]

Aſt, *aſta*, *eſta*, *heſtia*, ſignified, our learned author ſays, the *Fire*, *or the deity of that element*; but ſtill we are left in the dark with regard to the tongue. On this ſuppoſition, however, he diſputes an etymology of Dr. Hyde with reſpect to *Iſtakhar* or *Perſepolis*; and I muſt venture to differ not only from both, but even from the Farhang Jehangiri. The learned Doctor imagines this city to have been named from a palace or temple hewn out of a Rock; and derives it, in conſequence, from the eighth conjugation of an Arabic verb, which has a reference to *Stones*. The derivation is ſufficiently vague in any point of view; but the tracing it to an Arabic origin ſeems to deſtroy it at once. It is not till the ſeventh century of the Chriſtian era, as before obſerved, that we are to look for the introduction of Arabic words into the Perſian language: whilſt *Iſtakhar* is a city of ſuch high antiquity, that the origin is loſt in uncertainty and fiction. King Gemſhid is the hiſtorical founder of it: Romance carries it beyond Adam, and aſcribes it to Jan ben Jan, the

king of the Genii: the one indeed may be as fabulous as the other; but they both incontestibly prove its extreme antiquity. To suppose then, that the Persians, who appear, in all ages, to have been remarkably attentive to give every place a name, in their own tongue, expressive of some peculiar quality, or commemorative of some great event, should, on the foundation of their metropolis, their chief temple, or their royal palace, have recourse to a language they apparently knew nothing of; and spoken by a people whose political consequence could then intitle them to no superior respect; appears equally visionary as hunting for the etymologies of London or Paris, in the dialects of China or Japan. Mr. Bryant is led to question this derivation, but upon grounds I am afraid more refined than solid. "I am entirely a stranger (says he) "to the Persic and Arabic languages; yet I "cannot acquiesce in his opinion. . . . The "place, to be sure, is built of stone taken "from a quarry or rock: but what temple "or palace is not?" This reasoning does not seem conclusive; for, were there not, even in England, numberless palaces and churches built of materials very different from stone, the caprice of founders cannot always be accounted for: and he might, with the same

force of argument, dispute the existence of *Cività Vecchia*, or *Newcastle*; because all cities must, in time, grow old; and every castle must have once been new. But the interpretation which this objection is meant to introduce, stands upon a bottom by no means more substantial; for where does *Esta* signify *fire*, and *char* a *palace* or a *temple*? Not apparently in the Persian, to which alone we ought to look for the etymon of a Persian metropolis: and this idea has accordingly been followed by the author of the Farhang, who deduces it from a word, which in that language signifies a *large cistern* or *tank* hollowed out of the rock: but this derivation appears also to be exceptionable; as every circumstance of likelihood will lead us rather to imagine, that the cistern, instead of originally bestowing a name, received its own afterwards from the temple; to which it was not only inferior in importance, but subsequent probably in point of time: whilst the sacred application of its waters, to some of the higher mysteries of their religion, might soon cause the name universally to prevail, and to denote, in general, any similar reservoir of water: as *Spaw* is now, from its celebrity, applied often by us to denote any mineral spring. Having thus dissented from such respectable authorities,

I ſhall now proceed to hazard two etymologies, which have at leaſt the appearance of ſtanding upon a broader and more ſimple baſis. *Iſta* denotes a *place*, *ſtation*, *dwelling* (from the Perſian verb *Iſtaden*, To ſtand, remain, dwell); *Khur* or *Khar* ſignifies the *Sun*: whence *Iſtakhar* will naturally imply, the *place or temple of the Sun*. *Iſta*, *eſta*, or *aſta*, means alſo *praiſe* (from the verb *ſutuden*); and, in this ſenſe, the combination of theſe words will expreſs *Praiſe of the Sun*: both of which interpretations ſeem to be unforced; and to be highly characteriſtic of the capital and chief temple of an empire, where, from time immemorial, the Sun had been the great oſtenſible object of adoration.

Shem, *ſhamen*, and *ſhemeſh*, we are next told, are terms relative to the Heavens, and to the Sun; and here we have Hebrew authority: but every concluſion the learned gentleman has formed, from the premiſes, is another demonſtrative proof, how much in the dark the beſt judgment muſt wander; when building upon etymological definitions, without a knowledge of the languages whence the information ſhould be drawn: *Samos*, *Samothrace*, *Samora*, and ſuch names, if they really are of Eaſtern extraction, muſt flow from very different roots: whilſt the chief point he

endeavours to fix, That Syria *from its name*, was peculiarly devoted to Solar worſhip, falls to the ground; neither of the names, *Sham* nor *Syria*, having the ſmalleſt reference to the Sun. *Sham*, by which that country is moſt generally known to the Aſiatics, is a root ſo little connected with the Hebrew *Shemeſh* or the Arabic *Shems*, that no inflexions of thoſe languages can ever poſſibly produce the moſt remote analogy. *Sham*, *Shamet*, or *Shamé* implies *Black*, a *black mole upon the face*, *the left hand*, &c. and this laſt ſignification is that which is in general received by the Arabians and the Syrians themſelves: a name, they ſay, this country obtained, at the ſame time that Arabia Felix was called *Yemen*, which implies the *right hand*; the one lying to the right and the other to the left of the *Kaaba*, or temple of Mecca. This is the derivation adopted, in particular, yet with ſome doubt, by the celebrated Sultan *Abulfeda*, who reigned in Syria about the middle of the fourteenth century; and wrote, in Arabic, an *Univerſal Hiſtory*, and a *Syſtem of Geography*. Upon this etymology, Mr. Bryant obſerves, "Abul-"feda ſuppoſes, that Syria is called Scham "quaſi ſiniſtra. It was called Sham for the "ſame reaſon that it was called Syria. Συρος "γαρ ὁ ἡλιος the ſame as Σειριος. Perſæ Συρη

"Deum vocant."— "Syria is called at this "day Souriſtan. Souris from Sehor, Sol, "Σειριος of Greece." But here, inſtead of correcting one error, our learned author has made two: becauſe were there even ſuch a word in Perſian, as above aſſerted, denoting the Sun; the Aſiatics would hardly write *Souri* or *Souriſtan* from the root *Sehor*; as *h* is a radical, and cannot be diſpenſed with.— Abulfeda's etymology obviouſly rejects the Sun; as a man of his learning and penetration could not poſſibly have been perplexed about the origin of his kingdom's name, had he ſeen any rational ground of derivation from that luminary. Yet it muſt be confeſſed, that the idea which he has followed, unleſs more exactly defined, is by no means convincing: for neither *Yemen* nor *Sham* appear to have any poſitive relation, in point of Right or Left, to the Kaaba; which muſt depend entirely upon the poſition a perſon may take when conſidering this temple. If you view it towards the north, theſe countries are undoubtedly found in the above poſitions; but turning towards the ſouth, they are reverſed; and in the Eaſtern and Weſtern directions, they are neither right nor left.— With regard to Syria I ſhall here hazard an etymology, which, whether it may be eſteemed juſt or not, flows at leaſt from the ſimple

untortured meaning of the word. This country has been ever famed for *roſes*; the Damaſc, roſe is celebrated even by our Engliſh poets. *Suri* in Perſian denotes a ſpecies of this flower, beautiful in colour and delicate in ſmell :[a] *Suriſtan*, or the *land of roſes*, might conſequently, with much propriety, have been given by the Perſians, to a country which produced them in ſuch perfection and abundance. *Stan* or *iſtan*, the adjunct, is, like our *ſhire*, ſometimes added, ſometimes dropt; *Fars* or *Farſiſtan*, *Suri* or *Suriſtan*, being indifferently uſed, as we ſay *Wilts* or *Wiltſhire*. Συρια is therefore pure Perſian, with the Greek termination; and through this medium comes our Syria, ſubſtituting only *y* for the Greek *υ*, upon the ſame principles with other ſimilar words adopted from that tongue (as ſyſtem from Συϛημα); the Engliſh pronunciation having no ſound preciſely correſponding with the Greek *ypſilon*. Having had occaſion to mention *ſtan* or *iſtan* above, it may not be improper to point out ſome miſtaken concluſions which Mr. Bryant has drawn from this termination. "*Tin*, he obſerves, ſignified a kind of high "altar; that it prevailed amongſt the ancient "Hetrurians; that it formed the compounds "*Numantinus*, *Palatinus*, *Aventinus*; and that "it appears to be the ſame with *tan* in the

" East, which occurs occasionally in *Mogulis-*
" *tan*, *Indos-tan*, *Pharsis-tan*, *Chusis-tan*."
In regard to the Roman examples, it seems to be straining, to the utmost, etymological refinement, to make any thing more of them than mere possessive adjectives; as these names appear to have no more title to any meaning of mystery, than *Alexandrine* from *Alexander*, *legatine* from *legat*: but with respect to the Asiatic illustrations, which are produced in support of this ingenious theory, they have positively not the least foundation; neither *tan* nor *tin*, in this sense, being even known in any Eastern dialect, as will be more fully explained in the notes.

As I apprehend enough will appear, in the foregoing observations, to point out the comprehensive utility of the Arabic and Persian languages in every discussion of high antiquity: and as this preliminary dissertation is merely designed to touch generally upon such topics as may have a tendency to throw light upon the subject at large; the bounds and intention of this sketch will not permit me to enter into a more minute investigation of Mr. Bryant's very learned and valuable work. Some slight observations on other particles will be found in the notes; and with them I shall, for the present, close my philological

remarks. I wish, however, it may not be understood, that I place any uncommon weight on the definitions which I have any where offered; by supposing them to be the positive origin of the proper names to which they are applied. My chief purpose has been simply to show, that the significations brought from the Arabic and Persian languages are expressive; and may easily, without violence, justify a possibility of their having been so employed. But I am too sensible of the uncertainty which must always accompany every similar conjecture, to consider them on higher ground than points of mere curiosity, and incentives to deeper investigation. How many obscure circumstances, known only to the founders, have concurred in giving names to places? How difficult is it to determine, whether they were denominated from Chiefs, from Events, or from Peculiar Qualities of Situation? and how many have derived names from more Ancient Structures, to which they bore a resemblance merely in some subordinate circumstance; that left not a ray to trace the great original meaning? Innumerable examples might be brought: but I shall confine myself to one obvious instance. The *Pantheon of Rome* was dedicated *To all the Gods*; and its Grecian name was perfectly descriptive of

the design. Its architecture was pleasing; future artists admired it; and domes arose in distant countries consecrated to any thing but gods. What a noble field of critical investigation might not the *Pantheons* of the *Escurial* and of *London* furnish, therefore, to antiquaries, two thousand years hence; could we suppose, for a moment, the *Pantheon of Agrippa* to be forgotten; and the languages and history of Greece and Rome to be then as completely involved in darkness, as those of high antiquity are to the researches of modern times. [p]

Upon the whole, an able general will make admirable dispositions even on bad grounds. Mr. Bryant's arguments will ever command respect; but the stations he has chosen must, in my humble opinion, baffle all his skill to defend. Without an acquaintance with those Eastern tongues, all analysis of Eastern names must be completely fanciful: for whilst numbers of words, which may be expressed perfectly alike in European characters, have roots and meanings totally different; others, which, in the eye of a stranger to the dialects, may bear no resemblance, will claim the same radical origin, and possess little variation of sense. Widely differing, therefore, as those Eastern inflexions are from the genius of European

tongues, it muſt be evident, even to thoſe who have never made them an object of ſtudy, that the ſame principles which might guide an enquirer through the etymologies of the one claſs, muſt, in general, palpably miſlead his reſearches in the other. It will hardly be conſidered, at the ſame time, as a ſubſtantial ground of defence, for this ingenious gentleman, to advance arguments, ſimilar to thoſe he has already uſed in reſpect to the Hebrew: "I do not, ſays he, deduce them (i. e. etymologies) from the Hebrew. And though there may have been, of old, a great ſimilitude between that language and thoſe of Egypt, Cutha, and Canaan: yet they were all different tongues.. There was once but one language among the ſons of men."— Let it be admitted, that there was one great original language, whence the Hebrew, the Arabic, and all the loſt and living dialects of antiquity were deſcended; is it not rational to conclude, that a conſiderable part of thoſe tongues, which ſtill exiſt, did actually preexiſt in that aboriginal language: and that the variety of loſt idioms, which, in early times, prevailed in Lower Aſia and Egypt, were either the immediate derivatives from that language, or dialects of its moſt diffuſive branches? [a]

Those tongues in particular which Mr. Bryant mentions, if they ever did live, have certainly long ſince expired: where then ſhall we ſearch for a diſcovery of their characteriſtic traces? where but in the Hebrew, in the Arabic, in the Syriac, in the Perſic; which were unqueſtionably ſpoken in the ſame or in the ſurrounding countries; and either gave them birth, were derived from them, or claimed one common ſource. Can any ſtronger preſumption be furniſhed of the truth or probability of this poſition, with regard eſpecially to the Arabic and the Perſian, than the unconſtrained meanings which have been brought from thoſe languages for almoſt every radical particle, choſen by this learned gentleman as the baſis of his ſyſtem? Could this be the effect of chance? Is it not a ſtriking proof of their antiquity and utility? And do not ſuch etymons carry far more forcible conviction to our underſtanding, than dark and unſatisfactory derivation from unknown tongues? A ſyſtem of evidence, which proves either too much or nothing at all: for if one writer is allowed to roam through the regions of fancy, and fix arbitrary interpretations to a favourite claſs of words, another and another have an equal right: and every ingenious critic may then, like Archimedes of old, require only

ſome tranſmundane ſtation on which to rear his engines; in order to ſhake to pieces the reaſon of man, as that famous Syracuſan boaſted he could have done our globe; had another world been found on which to fix his great mechanic powers.

CHAP. III.

SECT. I.

Obſervations on Eaſtern manners. Conjectures on channels through which Eaſtern cuſtoms may have flowed into Europe. Improbability of the expedition of Oden from the Euxine to Scandinavia. Tartary the great officina gentium *of the barbarous invaders of the Roman empire. Miſtakes of our greateſt writers with regard to the Tartars. An example brought from Monteſquieu.*

TO touch ſlightly on the extenſive ſubject of Eaſtern manners; and to trace, in a few inſtances, their probable influence on thoſe of modern Europe, will now be the ſubject of a ſhort enquiry. I am ſenſible that we may refine too much, by deriving every reſemblance of cuſtoms in one country from the apparent counter part in another. In different quarters of the world, a ſimilarity of

habit has been discovered amongst people, in other respects wholly dissimilar: and mankind, in parallel situations, will often think alike, without the least communication of sentiment. We may not, at the same time, reason always justly, in looking only to the era of great events for the influx of novel customs. We are stunned by the rolling of a torrent, whilst the humbler stream glides unnoticed by; and many cirumstances may have been placed to the account of revolution and conquest, which possibly originated from simpler causes, and flowed in by less perceptible channels. How far the following theory may be found just, will depend therefore upon its probable co-incidence with the history and habits of mankind: in such remote enquiries we can hardly hope for more.

ROMANTIC Fiction has long been considered as of Eastern origin; and many systems have been framed to fix the period of its introduction into Europe. The *Saracen Conquest of Spain*, and the *Cruzades*, have been chiefly built upon; and the hypothesis of *Oden's flight from the Euxine to Scandinavia*, has of late been adopted by an intelligent and pleasing writer, to account for its early prevalence amongst our Gothic ancestors. It is certainly evident, that not only Romance, but many

customs and modes of thinking, appparently Asiatic, were found amongst those fierce invaders, before their irruption into the Roman empire: yet, as there is no probability in the tale of Oden, I shall, after assigning a few reasons for refusing my assent to this wonderful expedition, hazard some conjectures on the channels, through which those characteristic Eastern manners may have flowed into our Western regions. [b]

MANY learned Northern Antiquaries, from traditions in old Runic poems, and other suspicious materials, have framed a historical system with regard to their great hero Oden; which, though evidently intended to heighten the character of that famous Scandinavian lawgiver, seems indeed the most severe of satires. Oden, they say, was the chief of a Sarmatian tribe, inhabiting the banks of the *Lake Meotis*; or, according to others, the country between the Euxine and Caspian Seas, now called *Gurjestan* or *Georgia*; who, terrified at the progress of the Roman arms, after the defeat of Mithridates by Pompey, abandoned his country, at the head of a vast body of his people, and settled in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and other Scandinavian districts: where he laid the foundations of that power, which, in after-ages, overwhelm-

ed the Roman empire. But if the *Palus Meotis* is fixed as the dominions of Oden, even the din of war could hardly have reached his ear: whilſt the impreſſion made upon the countries between the ſeas was too ſlight to have alarmed the moſt effeminate of nations. Pompey was but a ſhort time at Colchis: Mithridates had fled before his arrival. The conqueſt of that country was not his object: he had more important views. He left it almoſt immediately; and marched againſt Tigranes into Armenia. The Iberians and Albanians, the old inhabitants of Georgia, inſtead of flying, laid many ambuſcades to harraſs him. On the defeat of Tigranes, he returned to chaſtiſe thoſe people for daring to inſult the Roman arms. They again oppoſed him; but afterwards ſued for peace; which he granted, without any ſeverity of condition. Pompey proceeded immediately againſt the Syrians and Medes; and we hear of him no more in thoſe parts. The Romans, unlike the barbarian invaders of their empire, who marked their route with deſolation, though an ambitious, were by no means a cruel enemy. A nominal obedience to the ſenate was often all they required, from thoſe diſtricts in particular which ſkirted their dominions: and protection was ever the reward of ſubmiſſion.

Whence then could originate a terror ſo dreadful, as to frighten a people, not completely puſillanimous, from a country hardly attacked; capable of great natural defence; interſected in various directions by rugged mountains and extenſive foreſts; and hurry them from the mild latitude of 42, to the degree of 57 north: a region to them unknown; barren, bleak, and of a ſeverity of climate, which, even now, with all the advantage of cultivation, muſt chill to inaction the conſtitution of a Southern Aſiatic? Would it not have been flying, at the ſame time, from the mere echo of war, to encounter difficulties almoſt unſurmountable? To have pierced to the frozen latitude of Scandinavia, over mountains, and rivers, and ſeas; through woods, and marſhes, and hardy ſavages; implies a degree of perſevering intrepidity, widely differing from that abject timidneſs which firſt induced them to fly. There is a ſtriking difference, let it be remembered, between emigration and flight; between the enthuſiaſm and animation which muſt poſſeſs a body of adventurers departing in queſt of plunder and new diſcoveries, and the trembling fugitives from imaginary alarms. A fearleſſneſs of danger will diſtinguiſh the firſt; a wretched deſpondency will mark the other. Yet in

this tale, those opposite characters must have been found in the same people; and Oden and his tribe, from despicable cowards, must suddenly have been transformed to paragons of heroism. But Nature rejects the idea; and History should reject it too. We err when we take it from the province of Romance. We ought to consider it in the light of a mere Scaldic fable, invented to trace the origin of *Gothic* and *Roman* enmity; as the far more probable fiction of *Dido* and *Æneas* was supposed to account for the irreconcileable antipathy between *Rome* and *Cartharge*. The epoch of the expedition seems, at the same time, to bring Oden too far down. He is celebrated as a deity in Runic Odes of very ancient date. The Gods of every barbarous country are generally carried up to the highest periods of society. The era of this personage, whether real or imaginary, must apparently be of more remote antiquity. A mere modern would hardly have been the object of such early and enthusiastic worship.

The great *officina gentium*, whence such myriads of barbarians have at different periods poured into the more cultivated regions of the earth, appears, with every probability, to have been *Tartary*: tho' our greatest writers, following Jornandez, the Gothic abridger of

Caſſiodorus, have looked only to Scandinavia, and the Northern parts of Germany, for thoſe bodies of fierce warriors, who, in the early ages of Chriſtianity, overturned the government, and changed the manners of Europe. The *Tartars*, *Scythians*, or *Turanians* (under which general names the hiſtorians of different nations have comprehended the inhabitants of that immenſe tract, ſtretching from 53° to 130° Eaſt longit. and from about 39° to 80° North lat.) have from the oldeſt times been remarked for a roving, irregular, martial life. People, whoſe riches centered in cattle, who wandered for paſture from diſtrict to diſtrict, could in conſequence have no attachment to a ſpot. That *amor patriæ*, ſo conſpicuous in the Hottentot, in the Laplander, and in the wild inhabitant of every barren rock, has never been diſcovered in men of this deſcription. Attached to his tribe, and glorying in an extenſive line of anceſtors, the *natale ſolum* is to the Tartar an object of the moſt perfect indifference; and to abandon it, in the company of his friends, a circumſtance rather of choice than regret. Theſe great outlines have accordingly marked the operations of this extraordinary people from the moſt ancient times. Without thoſe reſtraints on matrimony, which are found in

more civilized communities, their numbers had naturally a prodigious increaſe; and as they deſpiſed the idea of cultivating the ground, the ſame extent of country which could have maintained thouſands of huſbandmen, was found often inſufficient for hundreds of roaming paſtors. Emigrations alone could remedy this inconvenience. A celebrated warrior had only to proclaim, therefore, his intention of invading ſome neighbouring ſtate or more diſtant country. He was immediately joined by the chiefs of many hords. Chance, oftner than deſign, might ſhape their courſe; to the South, to the North, to the Eaſt, to the Weſt: for every quarter of the globe has at different times been the theatre of Tartar eſtabliſhment or plunder. The ancient annals of the Perſians are entirely employed in commemorating their numerous wars with the Turanians beyond the Gihon. China and Hindoſtan have often felt their fury. Whilſt Jengiz Khan and Tamerlane, at the head of their bold and hardy ſubjects, approached nearer to univerſal monarchy than any conquerors of ancient or modern times.[d]

That the Weſt muſt have been the object of Tartar invaſion, as well as the Eaſt and South, there can be little ground to queſtion. Theſe people poſſeſs, as we may obſerve, the

whole interior almoſt of the Aſiatic and European continent. In a conſtant ſtate of action and re-action, hiſtory informs us, that they have burſt repeatedly upon every adjacent country. Like ſubterraneous vapours, when rarified beyond a certain degree, they have at times acquired a great expanſive force; and the violence of the exploſion in one part, would be generally in the ratio of the reſiſtance in others. In the vigour of the Roman and Perſian powers, they were often repulſed from their frontiers; but they would not always return. Without ſucceſs, without plunder, that would have been an indelible diſgrace. They might then have ſtruck to the Weſt or to the North, where, finding countries more thinly peopled; and the few inhabitants not only ſtrangers to the art of war, but unprotected by fortified towns; the oppoſition they might encounter, would in general be inſufficient to check their progreſs. Meeting with no rich ſpoils in thoſe countries, which could give a ſplendor to their expedition amongſt their countrymen, they would often be induced rather to ſettle in their conqueſts than to go back: and as there would be ſufficient territory for the invaders and the invaded, enmity would ſoon give way to intermarriages and ſocial intercourſe. The old

inhabitants would adopt by degrees ſome of the manners and beliefs of the Eaſtern ſtrangers: and theſe, in return, falling in with habits and ideas peculiar to the aboriginal people; a few generations would naturally incorporate them; and form in time thoſe various nations known by the names of *Goths*, *Vandals*, *Lombards*, or *Franks*; whoſe roaming, rapacious, *Tartar* genius, became afterwards conſpicuous, in the deſtruction of the Roman empire. No ſolid objection, it may be here obſerved, againſt thoſe ancient Tartar invaſions, can be built upon the ſilence of hiſtory; as this ſilence is the natural conſequence of the unlettered manners both of the conquerors and the vanquiſhed: and whilſt the ſhocks were too remote to be felt in the more civilized ſtates of Europe, we cannot hope to find them in *their* annals. Tartary, China, or Tonqueen, may poſſibly, even in the preſent times, be the theatre of mighty revolutions unknown in Europe: and it is a moſt undoubted fact, that Jengiz Khan, who ſubdued almoſt every country in the world to the eaſtward of the Euphrates, was dead many years before the accidental curioſity of Marco Paolo, who viſited the court of his grandſon Coblai Khan in the year 1260, made Europe acquainted either with him or his dominions.

From the reſearches and opinions of many Northern antiquaries, the *Scandinavian Goths* are diſcovered to have been early compoſed of two diſtinct bodies of people: the firſt Aborigines; the other Strangers; who are ſaid to have poſſeſſed a degree of refinement, civilization, and ſcience, far ſuperior to the older inhabitants. Frequent alluſions are made to their Aſiatic origin. Their dreſs, their manners, their language, being in general diſtinguiſhed by ſome epithet deſcriptive of ſuperior elegance. It may poſſibly be objected, that *Refinement* and a *Tartar* are ideas extremely repugnant: yet every thing of this kind is merely comparative; and the more ſavage inhabitant of the North, who never till then knew a luxury of dreſs higher than the ſkin of an animal which he had killed, may eaſily be ſuppoſed to have admired whatever was, even in a ſmall degree, ſuperior to his own. But, in fact, the dreſs and equipage of the Tartar chiefs have been, in general, uncommonly ſplendid; and few circumſtances ſeem to have been leſs attended to, by ſome of our greateſt writers, than a proper diſtinction between the ruder and the more poliſhed people who fill the immenſe extent of Tartary. Men totally diſſimilar are grouped together, under one indiſcriminate character, merely becauſe

they are known in Europe by one general name: whilst, among their numerous nations, a difference of character may prevail, not inferior perhaps to that which marks an *Englishman* from a *Frenchman*, a *Hollander* from a *Portuguese*. [f]

NOTHING in nature can be more opposite than the *civilized Arabian* of *Mecca* to the *ferocious plunderer of the desert*; and the *citizen* of *Samarcand* has few features in common with the *Tartar wanderer in the Northern wilds*: yet even the great Montesquieu compares those people without distinction; and draws conclusions which are by no means supported by their manners, their government, or the geography of their countries. In some parts of Tartary there are large and flourishing cities, fertile plains, and noble rivers: in others, deserts, mountains, marshes, and forests; yet, amongst other positions, he says, "They have no towns; they have no forests, "and but few marshes: their rivers are al-"most always frozen, and they dwell in an "immense plain." These are positive assertions; and they are all equally groundless as positive: but Montesquieu is here endeavouring to support a system; and system is dangerous even to the soundest reasoner. Can a region, containing above twenty millions of

ſquare miles, watered by ſuch rivers as the *Gihon*, the *Sihon*, the *Selenge*, and the *Aumur*; boaſting ſuch cities as *Samarcand*, *Bokhara*, *Caſhgar*, and *Caracorum*; cluſtered with foreſts; broken into mountains; inhabited by many different nations; diſtinguiſhed by every variety of ſoil, ſuperficies, and climate, be called, with propriety, *one immenſe plain*; or correſpond, in the moſt remote degree, with Monteſquieu's deſcription? The concluſions drawn too are as vague as the premiſes are unſubſtantial. The *wild Arabs* are a race of roaming thieves; the *wild Tartars*, in this profeſſional line, bear a pointed reſemblance of character. Between theſe, to ſupport an hypotheſis, he wiſhes to find a political contraſt. The *Arabs are free*; and he derives their freedom from their *Rocks*: the *Tartars* he chuſes to *make ſlaves*, and he gives them *an immenſe plain*. Yet if there is a being on earth, who enjoys every ſpecies of irregular liberty, it is the *wandering Tartar*. He is obedient to his chief in every circumſtance of war: but there ſubmiſſion ends. [g]

Every obſervation, indeed, on the habits of thoſe roving, daring people, ſtrikingly diſplays their love of liberty, and their ſimilitude of character, with the *old Gothic nations*. Their averſion to the culture of the ground;

their paſtoral life; their idleneſs; their eagerneſs for plunder, and martial excurſion; with many cuſtoms and beliefs, clearly Eaſtern; form altogether a chain of internal proofs, ſtronger perhaps than direct hiſtorical aſſerſion. By many Northern writers, they are actually diſtinguiſhed from the more ancient inhabitants of *Scandinavia*, by the epithet of *Orientals*: and nothing can ſurely approach nearer in reſemblance than the original northern invaders of the Roman ſtates, and thoſe inundations, *immediately from Tartary*, who, under the names of *Alans* and *Huns*, led by the famous *Attila* and other bold chiefs, overwhelmed the empire, towards the cloſe of the fourth century, and gave a final blow to the chains of Roman ſervitude. [h]

SHOULD the foregoing obſervations, with others which will naturally ariſe in the further diſcuſſion of the ſubject, furniſh arguments of ſufficient force to ſupport the above hypotheſis, we ſhall eaſily account for one great channel, thro' which many circumſtances, originally Eaſtern, penetrated into the Hyperborean regions: where, with ſuch ſhades of variation, as might naturally be expected from a difference of climate and temperament, they ſowed the ſeeds of that ſtile of manners, which finds nothing ſimilar to it in the characteriſtics of Greece and Rome. [i]

SECT. II.

Prevalence of the Feudal System in the East in early times. Traces of it in Persia; in Arabia; in Hindostan; in Turkey; in Tartary. Apparently introduced into Germany and Scandinavia, by the Tartars, before the irruption of the Goths into the Roman states.

THE Feudal System, which was introduced and diffused over Europe by the conquerors of the Roman power, produced, in a civil light, an alteration in laws, government, and habits, no less important than the dismemberment of the empire by their arms. Our greatest lawyers, historians, and antiquaries, whose object has been less to trace its origin than to mark its influence, have uniformly attributed this great foundation of the jurisprudence of modern Europe to the military policy of the Northern nations; and seem in general rather to have considered it as a consequence of their situation, after their conquests; than as existing previous to their ir-

ruptions. It appears not only to have formed, however, their great syſtem of polity before the grand invaſion, but to have flouriſhed in the Eaſt with much vigour in very early times.[a]

In Perſia, Tartary, India, and other Eaſtern countries, the whole detail of government, from the moſt ancient accounts down to the preſent hour, can hardly be defined by any other deſcription. We obſerve, in general, one Great King, to whom a number of ſubordinate princes pay homage and tribute: all deviation from this ſyſtem ſeeming merely temporary and accidental. Poſſeſſed of every eſſential power of royalty, the degree of dependence of theſe ſecondary kings, we find, has ever been proportioned to the vigour or imbecillity of the paramount ſovereign: for where no ſolid code of conſtitutional laws prevails, the brilliant or diſgraceful periods in the hiſtory of a people will generally depend upon the genius of one man. A great monarch will give to the component parts the appearance of one deſpotic whole; whilſt the approaches to diſobedience will ever be proportioned to the weakneſs of adminiſtration. Conſtantly recurring, however, to firſt principles, every variation of Oriental Rule preſents only, to our alternate view, an overgrown

empire, feebly governed, crumbling into independent kingdoms; and independent kingdoms again uniting, to form the empire of some more fortunate and enterprizing sovereign. [b]

A GENERAL view of the histories of Eastern nations would, perhaps, sufficiently support the above positions; but I shall venture to offer a few particular authorities. The more ancient facts, it may be observed, like every remote event, will not admit of positive proof; but in tracing manners or modes of government, absolute historical or chronological precision is by no means requisite. The actions of one prince may be imputed to another; anachronisms and misnomers may abound; and the atchievements of twenty warriors may swell the renown of one hero: but no writer will attribute to his nation Customs and Ideas of Government, to which they or their ancestors were strangers; and against which the opinions of his fellow subjects must instantly and loudly revolt. When uncommon and great innovations happen, in the customs of a country, writers are careful to trace their origin, to fix their introduction, and to observe their influence. But when circumstances, however interesting, are simply mentioned, without particular observation or commentary, we may rationally conclude, that

ſuch cuſtoms are of high antiquity; and no more deſerving of ſpecial animadverſion than the general complexion, configuration, or temperament of their countrymen. The riſe and progreſs of the Feudal Syſtem in Europe is marked: it was an exotic plant; and it has, of conſequence, engaged the attention of our ableſt antiquaries. But in the Eaſt it is indigenous, univerſal, and immemorial: and the Eaſtern hiſtorians have never dreamt of inveſtigating its ſource, any more than the origin of regal government. Both have long been to them equally familiar; and the firſt extenſive monarchy gave probably a beginning to the firſt dependence of feudal chiefs. It may be thought too, that examples of this, or any other cuſtom, brought from events, ſubſequent to their introduction into Europe, can be no corroborative proof of their ſubſiſting in the Eaſt, previous to their appearance in the Weſt. But the leaſt attention to Oriental Manners will clearly ſhow, that the characteriſtic habits of thoſe people, even at this hour, are, in every reſpect, ſimilar to the moſt remote accounts: nor have we ground to believe, that (the Mohammedan religion and fire arms excepted) there is one ſingle cuſtom peculiar to the Perſians, the Arabians, or the Tartars, of the preſent day, which did

not prevail amongſt their anceſtors at a period too remote for human reſearch. With a wonderful predilection for their own ancient manners, they have a peculiar and invincible antipathy to thoſe of Europe. They are ſo oppoſite to their genius, to their hereditary prejudices, and to every idea political and religious, that no inſtance can be produced, perhaps, of one ſingle cuſtom originally European having ever been adopted by the Aſiatic nations: the Turks even, whoſe vicinity expoſes them moſt to Weſtern innovation, preſerving ſtill unchanged that remarkable diſtinction of character which they poſſeſſed before they croſſed the Boſphorus of Thrace. On this ground, therefore, I give no anecdotes as unqueſtioned truths: they are mentioned by Aſiatic hiſtorians; and I offer them ſimply as beliefs in original cuſtoms. We may not ſubſcribe to the apparition of Cæſar's ghoſt before the battle of Philippi; but we may reſt aſſured, that it would not have been recorded by Plutarch, had it not, in his time, been univerſally believed.

ABOVE 800 years before the Chriſtian era, an uſurper called Zohak, we are informed, reigned in Perſia. His government was oppreſſive, and became at length unſupportable. The citizens of Iſpahan flew to arms; and,

headed by a Blackſmith named Gao, attacked, defeated, and killed the Tyrant. Gao, after this victory, diſcovering the retreat of Feridoun, the heir to the crown, placed him on the throne; and received, in return, Iſpahan, with its dependencies, as a feudal principality. What truth may be in this remote event it is impoſſible to determine; but it is a generally recorded fact, that the Blackſmith's apron, ſaid to have been diſplayed by Gao, when marching againſt Zohak, as a banner, from the point of a ſpear, was taken by the Arabians at the battle of Cadeſſia, when they conquered Perſia in the year 636. It had been laid up in the treaſury of the Perſian kings, and was enriched with jewels to a prodigious value. It was conſidered as the great ſtandard and palladium of the empire; and was never carried to the field but on important emergencies, or when the king marched in perſon.—Roſtam is a hero whoſe prowefs is highly celebrated. He is equally the favourite of Hiſtory and Romance. He was a ſucceſsful general under the firſt kings of the Kaianian dynaſty; and received, in reward for his ſervices, the provinces of Sejeſtan and Zableſtan, as feudal appannages of the crown of Perſia: on the condition of marching a body of forces, as the exigencies of the ſtate might

require; but particularly to repulse the inroads of the Tartars.—Babylonia, Syria, Assyria, and Media, as formerly observed, seem to have been merely feudatory kingdoms of the old Persian empire.—Alexander the Great divided the Eastern provinces of Persia amongst the princes to whose families they had originally belonged. On this occasion they received a banner from the hands of the conqueror, paid homage, and engaged to maintain a certain number of troops, upon a footing (says the author of the Tarikh Montekheb) somewhat resembling the military vassals of the Ottoman empire, called *Sanjacs* and *Timars.* These princes are called by the Mohammedan writes *Molouku'l' Tawayif* (kings of the nations); and are by some considered as a particular dynasty, between the Kaianians and the Ashcanians, commonly called Arsacides by Europeans. They strictly performed, it is added, their feudal engagements to Alexander; but on his death, as the Grecian commanders seized upon the Western kingdoms, they also assumed an independency in their respective provinces. This account seems highly probable; as the successors of Alexander, according both to the Eastern and Western writers, soon lost all sovereignty to the eastward of the Tigris. *

The Tobba, or king of Arabia Felix, was the acknowledged paramount ſovereign in very old times of a number of tribes.—Moſt of the provinces of Arabia on the Perſian gulph, with thoſe ſtretching towards Babylonia, held of the Perſian kings of the Saſſanian dynaſty; who often appointed feudatory princes on the death or miſconduct of their predeceſſors.—The Khalif Almamon gave Khoraſan, which he himſelf held as a feudal ſovereignty under his father Haron Arraſhid, to his great general Thaher; where he ſoon after became independent, and founded the dynaſty of Thaherians.—Motamed, the fifteenth Khalif of the houſe of Abbas, gave, in the year 874, the great province of Mawarannahar, as a feudal government, to Naſſer ben Ahmed; which his brother and ſucceſſor Iſmael, eighteen years afterwards, erected into a monarchy, and founded the dynaſty of the Samanides.—Similar grants were made or extorted from ſucceeding Khalifs; ſo that partly by gift, partly by uſurpation, the Khalifat, from the middle of the ninth century, till its diſſolution in the year 1258, was in fact one immenſe feudatory empire: where every Sultan acknowledged the ſuperiority of the Khalif; but, like the great feudal chiefs in Europe, paid him juſt that degree of obedience which

each judged consistent with his own interest. —A similar system prevails to the present hour in Hindostan; through a regular gradation of *Subahs*, *Nabobs*, *Foujdars*, *Killadars*, and other subordinate chiefs; who all consider the *Great Mogul* as lord paramount of the empire.—In the Ottoman government there are many remarkable traces of the feudal system; especially in the Khan of the Crim Tartars, in the Wavyodes of Moldavia, Wallakhia, and other European districts; in Algiers and other Barbary States; in the Sherif of Mecca; in several Sheiks or princes of Syria; as well as in the military fiefs, which, under the titles of *Sanjacs*, *Zayms*, and *Timariots*, are bestowed with the express condition of supporting bodies of men, but especially of horse, ready to take the field at the order of the Sultan.

In *Tartary* we see it strong. Temujin, afterwards distinguished by the more celebrated name of Jengiz Khan, was the son of a chief, who had several feudatories; yet he himself held of Thogrul, the Khan of Caracum; better known by the name of *Prester John*. Thogrul, tho' a prince of great power, was still subject to the emperor of Katha, the paramount of Tartary; who accordingly, in the true feudal stile, summoned him with his arriére vassals to assist in quelling a dangerous

rebellion. Thogrul, attended by young Temujin, obeyed; a decisive victory was gained over the insurgents; in which both behaved with so much gallantry, that the emperor created Thogrul *Vang Khan*, which is a high royal title; and gave Temujin a considerable command in his army. When Temujin, by his success and abilities, had risen to a great degree of power, about the year 1205 a grand council of the Tartar nations assembled. Nine of the chief Khans appeared at the rendezvous, each attended by his vassals. They displayed nine large banners of command. They placed Jengiz upon an eminence, with a piece of black felt-cloth under his feet. The speaker of the assembly addressed him: he recognized him as emperor in the name of the whole; and told him, if merciful and just, that God would prosper his government; if not, his person and memory would become black and despicable as the felt on which he stood. A prophet called *Cokza*, and surnamed *the Image of God*, declared, that he had received a revelation from heaven, ordering Temujin to take, from that time, the name of *Jengiz*, which signifies *The most Great*. The Khans then advanced and paid him homage, bending the knee nine times; the nobles followed; and then the body of the people,

making the ſame number of genuflections, proclaimed him emperor with loud acclamations. We find ſome variation of ceremony in the inauguration of Tamerlane in the year 1369. He mounted a magnificent throne: he wore a brilliant crown: he girded himſelf publicly with his ſword: his feudatory princes acknowledged his ſovereignty by a profuſion of precious ſtones which they ſhowered over his head; whilſt a holy man put into his hands a drum, and a ſtandard, as the inſignia of imperial authority. [f]

EVERY thing in the hiſtories of thoſe princes is indeed completely feudal. Before their great expeditions, we find them iſſuing orders for the attendance of their great vaſſals, with their contingents of troops. And we alſo obſerve a conſtitutional Parliament or Meeting of Eſtates: who, amongſt other privileges, claimed that of trying great offenders. Artok Buga, one of the grandſons of Jengiz Khan, having revolted againſt his brother the emperor Coblai Khan, was at length defeated: but Coblai did not puniſh him, till he had called an Aſſembly of the States; where he was tried and condemned to be ſhut up between four walls, made of the tragacanth tree, where he lived twelve months. A feudatory prince of Herat, called Pir Ali, being

BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE

ſuſpected of a deſign to revolt ſoon after Tamerlane's inauguration, was cited to appear before the General Aſſembly: he evaded the ſummons till he had fortified his capital: upon which a decree was paſſed ſimilar to the Ban of the Empire in Germany; and Tamerlane being deſired to reduce him to obedience, he was accordingly put to death in conſequence of this ſentence. It is needleſs to multiply examples: but it may not be improper to obſerve, that thoſe General Meetings, called *Kourilltai*, bear ſo near a reſemblance to the Diets of the Gothic nations, that a ſtrong additional argument may thence be drawn to ſupport the hypotheſis of the early Tartar eſtabliſhments in Germany and Scandinavia. Jengiz and Tamerlane, powerful and deſpotic as they were, held many of thoſe Diets. The Great Khans, tho' generally choſen from the ſons of the late ſovereign, were elected by them; and primogeniture was of little conſequence. Jengiz Khan, for example, nominated his ſecond ſurviving ſon Octay, as his ſucceſſor: but though uncommon deference was paid to the will of a man whom the Tartars almoſt adored, the new emperor was not acknowledged, as ſuch, till the meeting of the Great Aſſembly two years afterwards; where, upon his expreſſing ſome reluctance to accept

of the imperial dignity, his elder and younger brothers, Jagathay and Tuli, taking him by the hands, inſtalled him on the throne, and ſaluted him *Khan*. Olug Nuvin, the youngeſt of Jengiz Khan's ſons, as maſter of the houſhold, preſented him with a cup of wine: and all the people making nine genuflections to their ſovereign, and three to the ſun, hailed him Emperor. [s]

It may not be unworthy of remark, that the ſituation of *Olug Nuvin* is a curious inſtance of a ſingular cuſtom, long prevalent in Tartary, as well as among the Northern nations; and even to be found in our old Saxon tenures, under the deſcription of *Borough Engliſh*: where the youngeſt ſon ſucceeds to his father in preference to his elder brothers. Sir William Blackſtone, after mentioning the opinions of Littleton and other eminent lawyers, in regard to the origin of this ſtrange cuſtom, conjectures, with great judgment, that it might be deduced from the Tartars. Amongſt thoſe people, the elder ſons, as they grew to man's eſtate, migrated from their father with a certain portion of cattle; and the youngeſt ſon only remaining at home, became in conſequence the heir to his father's houſe, and all his remaining poſſeſſions. Jengiz Khan had, agreeably to this idea, given to

his four eldeſt ſons great governments and great offices; but Olug always attended his perſon. During the interval of forty days, therefore, from the meeting of the Great Tartar Aſſembly, till the inſtallation of Octay Khan, this youngeſt brother ſeems to have been acknowledged by him and the other princes as Lord of the family: he was a kind of public adminiſtrator during this interregnum; and preſented the Great Khan with the cup on his enthronement, as the higheſt token of Eaſtern hoſpitality, which the maſter of a family can ſhow to a gueſt. [h]

IN the above outlines, we can obſerve ſeveral ſtrong traces of Gothic government. We can perceive the ruder draughts of States General, of Parliaments, of Juries; and, in the circumſtances of the Electors and the Elected, ſome ſtriking features of that ſyſtem, which ſtill unites the great Germanic Body. We can ſee, in the bent of national genius, the ſtrongeſt marks of wild freedom; with a regular gradation of military vaſſals: and altho' in their own country, from a general attachment to paſtoral life, Fiefs, or poſſeſſions in land, formed no part of Tartar juriſprudence or property; yet when they ſettled in the Weſt, a difference of ſituation would naturally ſuggeſt an alteration adapted to it. The more

ſteady temper of the native Scandinavians and Germans would modify the roaming Scythian ſpirit; a ſuperior attachment to a particular ſpot would naturally ariſe. As the country became more populous, ground would become more valuable; and what was formerly in common, to avoid diſputes, would then be portioned off. A wiſh to defend this property from new inroads might ſoon produce a more permanent and ſolid ſyſtem of ſubordination. And the more irregular ideas of the Tartars, improved by territorial poſſeſſion, pave thus, by degrees, the way for that more refined ſyſtem, ſo peculiarly adapted to the ſituation of ſettling invaders; which, in the fifth and following centuries, almoſt univerſally took place in Europe.

SECT. III.

Eastern notions of Supernatural Beings. Idea of the Peri or Faery System. The doctrine of enchantments originally Persian. Belief in Guardian Angels. Influence of this belief on their government and private life. Talismans, amulets, fascination.

NEXT to the Feudal System, and other maxims of civil government, which regulated the property and politics of the middle ages, few speculative subjects are more worthy of our attention than those novel ideas of Supernatural Beings, which ruled their minds with most resistless force. The universal belief in various orders of superhuman creatures, has prevailed in many parts of Asia long before the era of authentic history: and such complete possession have they taken of Eastern imagination, that the most serious, as well as the most fanciful compositions are filled with perpetual allusions to those imaginary beings. To understand Homer, we must have a previous knowledge of the dignities and attributes

of the Grecian Deities: to comprehend the writers of the Eaſt, we ſhould have an acquaintance with the mythology and popular beliefs of Eaſtern nations. For this purpoſe, I have thrown into the Dictionary ſlight ſketches of what ſeemed moſt peculiarly Aſiatic; and ſhall here bring thoſe remarks under one point of view; with ſuch additional obſervations as could not, with propriety, find any alphabetical place; or which may appear neceſſary to illuſtrate and connect the whole. [a]

THE fabulous Aſiatic ages ſtretch far beyond the creation of man. They ſuppoſe the world to have been repeatedly peopled by creatures of different formation, who were ſucceſſively annihilated or baniſhed for diſobedience to the Supreme Being. An Eaſtern Romance introduces the hero Caherman in converſation with the monſtrous bird or griffon *Simurgh*; who tells him, that ſhe had already lived to ſee the earth ſeven times filled with creatures, and ſeven times a perfect void: that the age of Adam would be ſeven thouſand years; when the race of man would be extinguiſhed, and their place ſupplied by beings of another form and more perfect nature; with whom the earth would end: that ſhe had then ſeen twelve periods, each of ſeven thouſand years; but was denied the know-

ledge of the duration of her own exiſtence. Thoſe beings, who inhabited the globe immediately before the creation of man, they call *Peris* and *Dives*; and they form a perfect contraſt. The Peris are deſcribed as beautiful and benevolent; and though guilty of errors which had offended Omnipotence, they are ſuppoſed, in conſequence of their penitence, ſtill to enjoy diſtinguiſhed marks of divine favour. The Dives, on the contrary, are pictured as hideous in form, and malignant in mind; differing only from the infernal demons in not being confined to hell; but roaming for ever around the world to ſcatter diſcord and wretchedneſs among the ſons of Adam. In the *Peris* we find a wonderful reſemblance to the *Faeries* of the European nations: and the *Dives* or *Genies* differ little from the *Giants* and *Savages* of the middle ages: the adventures of the Eaſtern heroes breathe all the wildneſs of atchievement recorded of the knights in Gothic romance; and the doctrine of enchantments, in both, ſeems to claim one common ſource. The various creatures who preceded Adam, were ſuppoſed to have been governed by a ſucceſſion of ſeventy-two *Solimans*: the laſt of whom is ſurnamed *Jan ben Jan*. This monarch had offended Omnipotence; and the angel Hares was ſent from

heaven to chastise him. A war ensued, which terminated in the defeat of the pre-adamite king; and Hares governed in his room. But this angel becoming intoxicated with power, Adam was created; and all the earth ordered to obey him. Hares, composed of the element of fire, scorned submission to a clay-formed creature. He rebelled against the Divine will; and was joined in his revolt by the Dives: but the Peris, acquiescing in the mandates of heaven, became from that time the friends of mankind. Hares, with his chief followers, were cursed by God, and doomed to a long period of torment in the infernal regions: but the other Dives were allowed to range over the earth, as a security for the future obedience of man. The residence of those ideal beings was imagined to be on the mountain of Kaf; which, in the East, was long supposed to surround the earth, as a ring does the finger: the globe being fancied to rest on one great emerald or saphire; the reflection from which gave the azure appearance to the sky: whilst its movements were productive of volcanoes, earthquakes, and all the convulsive phenomena of nature. The whole of this visionary country is called *Jinnistan*; and the respective empires are di-

vided into many kingdoms and cities. Thoſe of the Peris bear the names of *Shadukam* (pleaſure and deſire), *Gouherabad* (the city of jewels), *Amberabad* (the city of Ambergris): the metropolis of the Dives being called *Abermanabad* (the city of the Principle of Evil); where the enchanted caſtle, palace, and gallery of the Dive king Arzſhenk is the ſubject of much fable. The Peris and Dives are ſuppoſed to be formed of the element of fire; they live long, but are ſubject to death; and though poſſeſſed of ſuperhuman powers, have in many reſpects the ſentiments and paſſions of mankind. They wage inceſſant war; and when the Dives make priſoners of the Peris, they ſhut them up in iron cages, and hang them on the higheſt trees; to expoſe them to public view, and to every chilling blaſt. Here they are viſited by their companions, who bring them the choiceſt odours. Perfume is the only food of the Peris; and whilſt it ſerves as nouriſhment to the captives, it has alſo the virtue of keeping at a diſtance the inſulting Dives; whoſe malignancy of nature can endure nothing fragrant. [b]

When the Peris are in danger of being overpowered by their foes, they always ſolicit the aſſiſtance of ſome mortal hero; which furniſhes a wonderful fund of fanciful machinery

for Eastern Poetry and Romance. To put the Knight on a footing of prowess with those gigantic Dives, he is generally armed with enchanted talismans; and mounted on some tremendous monster. One of the most famous adventurers in Faery-land is Tahmuras, an ancient Persian king. The Peris honour him with a splendid embassy; and the Dives, who dread him, send also another. He consults the Griffon Simurgh: she speaks all languages and knows future events. She counsels him to aid the Peris; informs him of the dangers he will encounter; and gives him instructions how to proceed. She offers her assistance to conduct him to Jinnistan; and, as a token of friendship, pulls some feathers from her breast, with which he ornaments his helmet. He then mounts the Simurgh; and, armed with the buckler of Jan ben Jan, crosses the dark abyss, which mortals cannot pass without supernatural assistance. He arrives at Kaf: he defeats Arzshenk; and also another Dive, still more fierce, called Demrush; whose residence is described as a gloomy cavern, where he is surrounded with vast piles of wealth, amassed by plunder. Here Tahmuras, amongst other rich spoils, finds a fair captive, the Peri Merjan; whom the Dive had carried off, and her brothers had long

ſearched for in vain. He chains the vanquiſhed demons in the center of the mountain; ſets Merjan at liberty; and then, in the true ſpirit of Knight-errantry, flies, at the Peri's requeſt, to the attack of another powerful Dive, called Houdkonz; but here Tahmuras falls.—In the *Shah namé*, the celebrated Roſtam, many ages afterwards, engages the Dive Arzſhenk, who had eſcaped from the chains of Tahmuras; and kills him, after a fierce battle. Arzſhenk is there painted with a body ſomewhat human, and the head of a bull, which Roſtam ſtrikes off at a blow.—The Dive Munheras is wounded with an arrow in the mouth by Gerſhab, the laſt king of the Piſhdadian dynaſty; and he is afterwards put to death by Sohrab the ſon of Roſtam. In the firſt encounter he has the head of a hog; but in the next he is pictured as a bifrons; one ſide reſembling the head of a lion, the other that of a wild boar. Roſtam, who is conſidered as the Hercules of Perſia, among many other Dives, dragons, and enchanters, whom he deſtroys, kills a demon called the Dive Sepid: and Father Angelo mentions having ſeen a ſtupendous monument in the midſt of a plain, near the city of Fehelion, between Shuſter and Shiraz, ſuppoſed to be commemorative of this combat; which was cut into

a quadrangular fortification, with ſuch regularity, that it had the appearance of being formed of one entire ſtone. [c]

THIS Diſſertation would ſwell, however, to a diſproportioned bulk, were I to enter into a detail of the various wonderful adventures with which the Eaſtern Poems and Romances abound. I give theſe few outlines, merely to ſhow the general prevalence of Romantic Ideas in Aſia: but eſpecially in *Perſia*, the great claſſic ground of Eaſtern Fiction; and the centre whence it ſeems to have ſpread to almoſt every ſurrounding and diſtant country. So ſingular indeed is the reſemblance, in numberleſs inſtances, between the wild imagery of this ſtile of fabling, with that which prevailed in after-times in *Europe*, that we muſt either ſuppoſe, in the writers, a wonderful coincidence of luxuriant imagination, or conclude, that the Weſt muſt have borrowed from the Eaſt. I ſhall not inſiſt upon *Turpin's Twelve Peers*, upon the Armorican, Spaniſh, and other European Romances; where the ſimilarity of features is irregularly ſtriking: but even in the nobler works of *Arioſto*, *Taſſo*, and *Spencer*, we can diſcover the counter part of all their fanciful machinery in the fictions of *Perſia*. The *Ipogriffo*, on which *Aſtolfo* flies to heaven; and the *magic ring* of *Bra-*

damianté in *Orlando Furioso*: the *many-headed monster* of *Duessa*; and the *shield* of Prince *Arthur* in the *Faery Queen*: with the various enchantments of *Armida* and *Ismeno* in *Gierusalemme Liberata*; may all be traced to Oriental origin: whilst the *Peri Merjan* has much the air of being the *Faery Morgain*, who conveyed away our King Arthur, after the battle of Camelon; and with whom, according to the old British Romances, he now resides in Faery land with great happiness and splendor. [d]

SOME ingenious writers have considered this species of fiction as originating among the Arabians: but there are many reasons for believing, that it was absolutely unknown to them before the era of the Hejra; and that they did not adopt that mode of writing till long after the Persian conquest. Mohammed, as before observed, was uncommonly alarmed at the first romantic glimmerings, which were brought from Persia by the merchant Nasser. He was afraid lest the minds of his countrymen should be more strongly impressed with those wildly pleasing tales, than with the doctrines of the Alcoran: and he accordingly reprobated those foreign figments, as abhorred by God and the Prophet. The warriors, who figure in Faery-land, are all

ancient Persian kings and heroes. The Arabians have not even a word in their language expressive of the greatest beauty of Eastern Romance, the *Peri:* and altho' *Jin* is now used synonimously with *Dive*; yet its proper and original meaning was merely an Infernal Fiend; a Being very distinct from the Romantic inhabitant of Kaf. The same observation will hold, with regard to the most uncommon monsters; who seem all to be natives of Persian fancy: the words used by the Arabians, to express the Persian *Simurgh*, *Ouranabad*, or *Rakshé*; as well as their dragons and other machinery of Romance, having in general simple radical significations, expressive of creatures, which really exist; and seem only to have been figuratively applied, to those imaginary monsters, in later times. A large serpent, for example, is transformed into a dragon: an eagle, or a long-neck'd animal, represents the Simurgh: a dangerous or inhuman villain is turned into a Giant, a Demon, or any terrifying appearance: and a word, expressive of a Dreadful Calamity, or Sudden Horror, which deprives people of their senses, is metaphorically converted into a species of monster supposed to haunt woods, church-yards, and other lonely places; and not only to tear the living to pieces, but to

dig up and devour the bodies of the dead. As the language then of every people will always be obſerved to abound in radical words, expreſſive of every kind of imagery which has been long familiar to them; we muſt conclude, upon the beſt grounds, where ſuch words are not to be found; and metaphorical, or exotic expreſſions, appear to be the only ſubſtitutes; that the ideas, deſcribed by thoſe words, are not indigenous, but adopted from foreign nations: and as the Arabians have no terms, in their tongue, radically expreſſive of any thing ſuperhuman, excepting Angels and Devils; Romance, whoſe characteriſtic genius rolls entirely on a peculiar and diſtinct ſpecies of machinery, could not apparently have originated in Arabia. [e]

EXCLUSIVE of the univerſal belief in the fanciful *Peri Syſtem*, which may be called the *Mythology of Romance*, the ancient Perſians appear in general to have acknowledged one Supreme Being; and to have paid a high degree of reſpect to Angels, as ſubordinate deities. This, with a veneration for the ſtars, was the great doctrine of the Sabian[f] religion, which prevailed of old in Perſia, Arabia, and other Eaſtern countries. As theſe Angels are not only frequently alluded to in Eaſtern authors, but throw conſiderable light on the

detail of private life, a few obſervations upon them may not be unuſeful.[f]

When Ormuzd, or Omnipotence, created mankind, the Perſians ſuppoſe that he gave, at the ſame time, the ſuperintendency of the world, and of every thing animate or inanimate, to certain Guardian Angels. Though man was the peculiar charge of the Supreme Being, yet all his actions, and every accident to which he was liable, were ſtill imagined to be, in a great meaſure, dependent on the influence of the preſiding Angel. Every circumſtance of public or family concern had, in conſequence, their favourite times: eſtabliſhed ceremonies were obſerved with anxious attention; and various public feſtivals were appointed, to conciliate the benevolence of thoſe miniſters of heaven.[g]

To procure the favour, or command the ſervice, of Beings, who are ſuppoſed to be the cauſe of the felicity or miſery of man, was a natural wiſh; and ſome there were who pretended to poſſeſs this power. Hence the origin of charms, of taliſmans, and of all the armour offenſive and defenſive of enchantment. In the rudeſt times, there will be ever found men, who are better verſed in the arcana of nature than the uninformed multitude. A love of eaſe, and an averſion from pain, are the

great laws of nature, and the mind is perpetually fluctuating between a wiſh for the one, and a dread of the other. To pretend boldly therefore to a power of beſtowing happineſs, or removing miſery, hardly ever failed, in the days of ignorance, to gain a man believers: and he ſeldom found difficulty in intereſting the paſſions of the people, provided he could by any means impoſe upon their ſenſes. An attention to the principles of mechaniſm, to the operations of chymiſtry, to the virtues of plants, and to the various laws of nature, might produce diſcoveries incomprehenſible by ſimple men: and a few remarkable inſtances of the efficacy of mere natural cauſes, would eaſily gain the poſſeſſors of thoſe ſecrets the reputation of inflicting torment or of commanding pleaſure at a wiſh. To enjoy the reputation and advantages of thoſe fancied ſupernatural powers, was not enough. Some pretended to have the art of communicating them to others: necromancy became of courſe a regular ſtudy; and the people at large, who could not aim at ſuch occult ſciences, were happy to ſupply their want of knowledge, by the purchaſe of taliſmans, amulets, or charms, in whoſe virtues they placed a perfect and moſt wonderful confidence.*

TALISMANS and Amulets have long engaged the attention of Eaſtern nations; and accurate rules have been laid down for their conſtruction. The gem, the chryſtal, the metal, or other ſubſtance, is ordered to be dug, or ſearched for, when ſome particular angel rules the day. It muſt be prepared or engraved under the influence of another; and the *zemzemé*, or prayer of a third muſt be prononunced over it, to give it that myſterious virtue for which it is eſteemed. Different ceremonies are neceſſary in gathering the herbs, and flowers; in cropping the hairs of camels, ſea-cows, or other animals of which the amulets are formed: and the ſuſpending them round the necks of men, women, children, or animals, is performed with much preciſion and ſolemnity. Yet real knowledge might originally have given riſe to what the views of the artful, and the ſuperſtition of the ignorant, afterwards perverted to the purpoſes of folly. An intelligent obſerver might diſcover, that certain plants had their juices in high perfection at particular ſeaſons; that ſome ſhould be gathered at ſun-riſe, when moiſt with dew; others at the meridian, when under the influence of the mid-day heat. He might imagine, that the external application of medicinal herbs, of mineral ſubſtances, of

tufts of hair or wool, whilſt impregnated with the effluvia or perſpiration of the animal, might have a ſalutary effect in various ailments; and experience would confirm the juſtneſs of his conjecture. But the million, ever unable or unwilling to inveſtigate natural cauſes (eſpecially when impreſſed with a conviction, that every diſtemper, and every misfortune, proceeded from the operations of malevolent ſpirits, or the faſcination of malignant eyes), would impute the cures which ſuch applications performed, not to the eſſential qualities of their compounds, but to ſupernatural agency, and uneſſential ceremony. They applied them, in conſequence, without diſtinction, not only to the old and to the young, to the ſick and to the healthy, to the brute creation as well as to rational beings; but placed even things inanimate under their protection. An aſs's head, cabaliſtically prepared, and erected on a pole in a garden or field, was ſuppoſed to be an effectual defence againſt faſcination, and a conſequent ſcarcity of produce: whilſt a taliſman, buried along with hidden treaſure, was imagined to put it in perfect ſafety, by rendering it inviſible to every eye but thoſe of the owner. Nothing indeed is more common in the Eaſt than the burying of treaſure: and it took its riſe from

that unſteady ſyſtem of government, which has in general prevailed on thoſe countries. Ever apprehenſive of revolution and ruin, a rich man generally divdes his eſtate into three parts: one he employs in trade, or the neceſſary purpoſes of life; another he inveſts in jewels, which he may eaſily carry off, if forced to fly; and the third he buries. As he intruſts nobody with the ſecret of this depoſit, which he guards with his taliſman, if he dies before he returns to the ſpot, it is then loſt to the world; till accident throws it in the way, perhaps, of ſome fortunate peaſant, when turning up his ground. Thoſe diſcoveries of hidden treaſure, and ſudden tranſitions from poverty to riches, of which we read in Oriental tales, are by no means therefore quite ideal; but a natural conſequence of the manners of the people.

SECT. IV.

Obſervations upon the old Perſian era. Every month, every day, and every action of man ſuppoſed to have been under the ſuperintendance of particular angels. Short account of the feſtivals celebrated by the Perſians in honour of thoſe angels. The Aſiatics in general ſtrongly attached to omens, aſtrology, divination, and dreams.

TO underſtand the machinery of Angels, it will be proper to make ſome previous obſervations on the ancient Perſian era, with which they are intimately connected. This was ſuppoſed to have been eſtabliſhed by king Gemſhid, one of the Piſhdadian princes; the date of whoſe reign ſeems too uncertain even for conjecture: though ſome judicious writers place him about 800 years before Chriſt. On the day when the Sun entered Aries, he is ſaid to have made his firſt public entry into Iſtakhar or Perſepolis, which he had juſt finiſhed; and to have ordered the era to com-

mence from that time, in honour of the Sun, and to commemorate the building of his capital city. He divided the year into twelve months, of thirty days each; to the last of which they afterwards added five supplementary days, to make up the whole 365. No attention was, for some time, paid to any intercalation similar to our Leap Year; till astronomers, observing, at length, that the Sun, at the beginning of the year, had made a retrograde motion from Aries to Pisces, inserted one month at the end of 120 years; which they celebrated with one continued festival. Yezdejird, the last king of the Sassanian dynasty, reformed the Kalendar: and his era is adopted at this hour in many parts of Persia; particularly by the Parsis of Kirman, and by those of Guzerat in Hindostan. But all do not agree in the epoch of commencement; some dating it from the beginning of Yezdejird's reign, A. D. 632; some from his defeat at Cadessia in 636; and others from his death in 651. On the conquest of Persia by the Mohammedans the lunar computation was introduced; and it is still attended to in matters of religion: but about the year 1079, the Persian Kalendar was again reformed by the great Sultan Malekshah Jelaleddin; and continues now to be

adhered to in ſeveral parts of Perſia. This prince, whilſt he removed the Sun from Piſces to Aries, made alſo an alteration in the poſition of the months; under the idea of reſtoring the ancient mode fixed by Gemſhid. From thoſe changes, however, there has ariſen a diſagreement amongſt the different writers, with regard to the ſeaſons and days, when ſeveral feſtivals were celebrated; which, were it of conſequence, it would be difficult to reconcile: it being probable that, in later times, different provinces ſolemnized them upon the days which correſponded with the reſpective eras they had adopted; and that ſome ceremonies were perhaps introduced by the Mohammedan princes, which were unknown in Ancient Perſia.*

Every month was ſuppoſed to be under the guardianſhip of an angel, from whom it received its name. The ſubdiviſion by weeks was not known till later times; but every day had alſo a ruling angel of a ſubordinate degree; the ſuperior angels having each a day, in their reſpective months, which was obſerved with more than ordinary attention. Their feſtivals were, in conſequence, numerous; and many of them uncommonly ſplendid. I ſhall ſlightly touch upon ſuch as ſeem moſt worthy of notice. The chief were thoſe about

the Equinoxes; the next were those of Water at Midsummer, and of Fire at the Winter Solstice. The first was the *Nauruz*, which commenced with their year in *March*, and lasted six days; during which all ranks seem to have participated in one general joy. The rich sent presents to the poor: all were dressed in their holiday clothes; all kept open house; and religious processions, music, dancing, a species of theatrical exhibition, rustic sports, and other pastimes, presented a continued round of varied amusement. Even the dead, and the ideal things, were not forgotten; rich viands being placed on the tops of the houses and high towers, on the flavour of which the Peris and Spirits of their departed heroes and friends were supposed to feast. The Parsis of Guzerat still celebrate the last ten days of the year as a festival to departed Spirits. The first five days they suppose the souls of the blessed to hover three bow-shots above the earth; and during the five last they imagine, that not only they, but the damned also, visit their surviving friends: on which account, to give them the best reception, their houses are purified and decked out to the greatest advantage. During these ten days they never go from home.[b]

The festival of *Mihrgan* lasted alſo ſix days: it began about the middle of *September*; and was celebrated with ſome uneſſential difference of ceremony; both being in honour of their great oſtenſible deity, the Sun.—In *June* they ſolemnized the *Abrizgan*, in honour of the element of Water: to which, as well as Fire, they paid a high degree of reſpect. It laſted only one day; during which all degrees of people ſprinkled one another with pure water, or with diſtillations from roſes, orange flowers, and other odoriferous herbs.—In *December*, on the ſhorteſt night of the year, was the anniverſary of the great Feſtival of Fire, called *Sheb ſezé*; when their temples were illuminated, and large piles of fire blazed all over the kingdom; round which the people entertained themſelves all night with choral dances, and various amuſements peculiar to the ſeaſon. Amongſt other ceremonies common on this occaſion, there was one, which, whether it originated in ſuperſtition or caprice, ſeems to have been ſingularly cruel and pernicious. The kings and the great men uſed to ſet fire to large bunches of dry combuſtibles, faſtened round wild beaſts and birds; which being then let looſe, the air and earth appeared one great illumination: and as thoſe terrified creatures naturally fled

to the woods for ſhelter, it is eaſy to conceive that conflagrations, which would often happen, muſt have been peculiarly deſtructive, where a people conſidered the extinguiſhing of fire, by water, as one of the higheſt acts of impiety.

THERE were many other feſtivals; ſome of which ſeem whimſical; whilſt others had apparently an excellent political tendency. One of the moſt ludicrous appears to have been that which they celebrated about the Vernal Equinox, called *Kouſa niſhin*. This was an old beardleſs one-eyed figure, repreſenting Winter on his departure, mounted on an aſs or a mule, with a crow in one hand, and a ſcourge and fan in the other. In this manner he paraded the ſtreets, followed by all ranks of people, from the royal family to the beggar. Amongſt many frolics, which the populace played with the old man, they ſprinkled him alternately with hot and cold water; whilſt he, crying out *gurma, gurma*, (heat! heat!) ſometimes fanned himſelf, and ſometimes laſhed his tormentors. He had the privilege of going into every ſhop, and into every houſe; where the leaſt delay in preſenting him with a piece of money, gave him a right to ſeize the effects of every trader; and to beſpatter the clothes, even of the greateſt

nobles, with a mixture of ink, red earth, and water, which he carried in a pot by his ſide. But all were prepared for *Kouſa* at their doors; and their offerings were made the moment of his approach. What he thus received, from the beginning of the cavalcade to the firſt hour of prayer, was paid to the king, or to the governors of thoſe cities, where the ſovereign did not reſide: a circumſtance which ſeems evidently to point to a ſuperſtitious origin; for, upon any other ground, the whole of the poor creature's collections could be no object to men of their elevated rank. From the firſt to the ſecond hour of prayer, the amount of the receipts was the property of the old man; and here his pageant ended. He then ſuddenly diſappeared: for after this time, the firſt perſon he met in the ſtreets might ſeverely beat him with impunity. [d]

THE next feſtival, ſolemnized in *April*, called *Khurm ruz*, is in a different ſtile; and appears to have been founded upon the rational principles of good government; as it tended to give dignity to a moſt uſeful and reſpectable body of men. The king dined in public; and the chiefs of the farmers had the honour of ſitting at table with him: when their ſovereign addreſſed them in words to the following effect. "I am one of you; my ſub-

" ſiſtence, and that of my people, reſts on
" the labour of your hands: the ſucceſſion
" of the race of man depends upon the
" plough; and without you we cannot exiſt.
" But your dependence upon me is recipro-
" cal: we ought therefore to be brothers,
" and to live in perpetual harmony." [e]

In the month of *December* they held a feſtival in honour of deceaſed friends, images of whom they formed in paſte; which they placed where many ſtreets or roads met. They made offerings to them; treated them with great reſpect; and then burnt them with much ſolemnity.—In the ſame month was the ceremony of *driving the Dives from their houſes*. For this purpoſe the Magi wrote certain words with ſaffron on parchment or paper; and then ſmoked it over a fire, into which they put the horn of an animal killed on the 16th of *September*, cotton, garlick, grapes, and wild rue. The ſpell, thus prepared, was glued or nailed to the inſide of the door, which was painted red. The prieſt then took ſand, which he ſpread with a knife, whilſt he muttered over it certain prayers; and then ſtrowing it on the floor, the enchantment was complete: and the Dives were ſuppoſed immediately to vaniſh; or at leaſt to be deprived of all malignant influence. [f]

The fifth of *February* was considered as the proper day for *clearing their dwellings of ſcorpions*; a much more ſerious evil than the Dives. With this view, they paſted on three of the walls of the houſe, ſmall ſlips of paper, called *Nuſhtei Guzſhdum*, inſcribed with magic characters; none being ſtuck upon that in which was the gate-way. After various ceremonies, the door was opened, when thoſe noxious animals generally diſappeared; which they attributed entirely to the virtue of their ſpells: whilſt the ſprinkling of their habitations with compounds, offenſive to thoſe creatures, and other preparatory ſteps, were only conſidered as ſecondary cauſes.—But the moſt romantic of all their feſtivals ſeems to have been the *Merd giran*, celebrated in *February*, in honour of the preſiding angel *Isſendarmuz*. He was conſidered as the Guardian of the Fair Sex, who, on this occaſion, enjoyed very ſingular privileges. They were veſted with almoſt abſolute power. The huſbands complied, to the utmoſt of their ability, with all the commands of their wives; and the virgins, without offence to delicacy, might pay their addreſſes to whom they pleaſed; and they ſeldom ſued in vain. Numberleſs marriages were in conſequence ſolemnized, and many engagements made; the angel being

ſuppoſed to ſhew remarkable favour, not only to the nuptials then celebrated, but to all the contracts entered into during his gay feſtival. An inſtitution, which ſeems to bear ſome reſemblance to the ancient gallantry of *Valentine's day* in Europe. [g]

An attention to thoſe obſervances, as well as to fortunate days, fortunate names, and every circumſtance of ſupernatural influence, we find indeed was by no means confined, in the Eaſt, to the lower orders of men: the greateſt, and the moſt learned, appearing to have been impreſſed with a belief, equally ſtrong with that of the meaneſt and the moſt ignorant. An Aſiatic ſetting out on important buſineſs, would return if he met a perſon whom he ſuppoſed to have a *ſhum kudem* (a black or unlucky foot); or if he ſaw a deer deſcending a mountain, or appearing at his back. When a married man took a long journey, it was common for him to twiſt, in a particular manner, two branches of the broom called *retem*: if on his return he found them as he left them, he was perfectly ſatiſfied of the fidelity of his wife; but if any accident had unlooſed or diſcompoſed them, nothing could induce him to believe her innocent.—As in thoſe countries the crops were often deſtroyed for want of rain; amongſt

other ceremonies which they ſuppoſed had virtue to procure it, they tied ſome combuſtibles to the tail of a bullock, eſpecially of the wild breed; to which they ſet fire: and if he then ran up the hill, they looked upon it as a certain prognoſtic of rain.—When a Perſian peaſant thought his corn was too long in winnowing, he took a kind of baſtard ſaffron, called *bad engiz*, which he rubbed; and throwing it in the air, the wind was expected immediately to ſpring up.[b]

Astrology, divination, and the interpretation of dreams, were faſhionable ſtudies with men of rank; and they in general carried with them, wherever they went, pocket aſtronomical tables, which they conſulted, as well as aſtrologers, on every affair of moment.—*Amru*, one of the greateſt and moſt penetrating of the Arabian generals, after having ſubdued part of Egypt, and other countries, ſat down before Jeruſalem; and had almoſt reduced it to ſurrender, when he was told by an aſtrologer, that the predicted conqueror of the Holy City had only three letters in his name. Struck with this, Amru ſuſpended his operations, and ſent a meſſenger immediately to his maſter, the Khalif *Omar*, whoſe name in Arabic conſiſts of only three letters: and upon his arrival in the camp, the town

instantly capitulated. — *Tamerlane* seldom marched till the astrologers fixed the lucky hour: and an ideot having once thrown a breast of mutton at him, precisely at the time he was meditating the conquest of *Kharezmé*, sometimes called the *Breast of the World*, he interpreted it, before all his army, as an infallible omen of his success. Much good policy, as well as superstition, may possibly, indeed, have been at the bottom of Tamerlane's conduct; as it must have highly animated his troops, who were constitutionally impressed with the strongest ideas of omens, spells, and every species of supernatural belief: a most cruel proof of which their ancestors had given, when they over-ran the Khalifat in the thirteenth century: for many of the Mohammedans having a custom of carrying about them verses or chapters of the Alcoran, by way of preservatives or charms; the Tarters considered all they met, with such papers as enchanters; and put them to death without mercy. The Tartars have ever, indeed, been so strongly impressed with the notion of enchantments, that we meet with strange details in some of their most authentic writers. *Abulgazi*, King of Kharezmé, who writes a genealogical history of the Tartars, very gravely tells us, that Tuli, one of the sons of Jengiz

Khan, having been ſurrounded by the Kathay or Chineſe army, would have been cut to pieces, had he not ordered one of his magicians to turn Summer into Winter. The conjuror accordingly began his operations, and continued them for three days, when he brought down ſuch a ſtorm of hail and ſnow, that the Khan of Kathay's army, clothed in ſilken garments and thin ſtuffs, being unable to move, were ſlaughtered without reſiſtance. ---One Mahmoud, who pretended to be a ſorcerer, was followed by numbers; and fomented a dangerous revolt againſt Jagathai, another of the ſons of Jengiz Khan, who ſucceeded his father in Turkeſtan. His generals marched to attack the rebels; but, on the point of giving battle, the Mogul army finding themſelves enveloped by a thick fog, conceived it to be the enchantment of Mahmoud, and immediately fled, to a man. One arrow only, it is ſaid, was diſcharged; which by a ſingular accident killed the Sorcerer: yet ſo ſtrongly were his people impreſſed with his ſupernatural powers, that his brothers found no difficulty in perſuading them that he had only made himſelf inviſible for a little while; and aſſumed the adminiſtration of affairs till his return. This revolt was afterwards quelled with ſome difficulty.[l]

SECT. V.

Traces of Chivalry in the East. Importance of Women among the Arabians, Persians and Tartars.

CHIVALRY, or Knight-errantry, has ever been ſo intimately connected with enchantment, that, before we leave this ſubject, it may not be improper to make a few remarks on ſuch traces of it as may be diſcovered in the Eaſt. The peculiar ideas and habits of a people, as I have often had occaſion to obſerve, may be ſeen in their Poems and Romances, with a preciſion not inferior to their more ſerious and moral Writings; as a Poet of true genius, though he may aſcribe to his Heroes more virtues and fewer faults, than are to be found in the imperfect nature of man, will, at the ſame time, ever copy the living manners of the preſent or former times.—Single combats in the *Shah namé*, and other Eaſtern works of fancy, are innumerable.—Asfendiar was one of the moſt

famous warriors in Ancient Perſia. He challenges, fights, and kills Arjaſb, the ſon of Afraſiab, king of Turan: but being ſent by his father againſt the famous Roſtam, after a ſingle combat, which laſts two days, he is killed by the blow of a mace; Roſtam having diſcovered that he had a charm which rendered him invulnerable to ſpear, ſword, or arrow.—Roſtam has ſeveral duels with his own ſon Sohrab, whom he did not know; in the laſt of which he unfortunately kills him.—Thoſe heroes are armed with complete coats of mail, plumed helmets, ſpears, ſwords, maces and ſhields, with daggers, bows and arrows. Their armour, and the trappings of their horſes, are uncommonly ſplendid: and their mode of attack ſeems in every ſhape to have been exactly ſimilar to the tiltings of Knight-errantry: excepting in the circumſtance of the bow and arrow; which appears to have been chiefly confined to the infantry, after Chivalry became a regular inſtitution in Europe.—A famous combat is mentioned by all the Perſian writers, and ſeems to be founded on hiſtorical fact, between twelve choſen warriors of Perſia, and twelve of Tartary. The armies of Kai Khoſrou and Afraſiab were drawn up in battle array. To ſave the effuſion of blood, this

combat was propoſed; the ſucceſs of which was to fix the boundaries of the hoſtile empires. The Perſians gained the victory, chiefly by the prowefs of Roſtam; and the Tartar king immediately abandoned all the territory to the ſouthward of the Oxus. Cavun, one of the Perſian champions, ſeems to have been a knight-errant; for he was ſurnamed *Rezm khah*, One who goes in ſearch of adventures.—Among the Arabians, nothing was more common than challenging to ſingle combat. At the *War of the Ditch*, ſo called from the lines which Mohammed drew round Medina, when beſieged by the Koreiſh; one of the chiefs of that tribe ſent a general challenge to the Prophet's army: which was accepted by Ali; who killed both the challenger and his ſecond.—Ali ſome years afterwards challenged Moawiyah his competitor for the Khalifat, in the face of both armies, before the battle of Seffein. All the great officers of both ſides thought him bound in honour to accept it: but as Ali had no equal for ſtrength and addreſs in arms, Moawiyah judged it more prudent to decline.—Many ſingle combats were alſo fought between the Arabians and the Greeks at the ſieges of Boſtra, Damaſcus and other places in Syria.—Mention is made of two famous Arabian

Knights-errant, one called Abu Mohammed Al batal, who wandered every where in queſt of adventures, and the redreſſing of grievances. He was killed in the year 738. The other was a great grandſon of the Khalif Abubeker, named Giaffar al Sadik, who died in the reign of Almanſor, in the year 764—In an imperfect manuſcript, which has neither beginning nor end, I met, by chance, with the following anecdote of Giaffar al Sadik. This warrior, who was equally eminent for his piety and extenſive knowledge as for his renown in arms, was invited to court by the Khalif Almanſor, that he might profit by his counſel. Giaffar returned for anſwer, "Whoever has "a view only to this world, will not give "you ſincere advice; and he who regards the "next, will not keep you company." [a]

THAT mode, which prevailed in Europe, of the knights of hoſtile armies challenging one another to ſingle combat, during a truce, was very common in the Eaſt. I ſhall give one remarkable inſtance. The gallant Sultan Jelaleddin, whoſe father Mohammed, king of Kharezmé, was driven from his dominions by Jengiz Khan, having afterwards recovered part of his kingdom, marched about the year 1228 againſt the Georgians: when a truce having been agreed upon, in order to

adjuſt, if poſſible, terms of accommodation, the great men of both armies ſent mutual defiances, and many combats were fought. Jelaleddin, diſguiſing himſelf like a private knight, entered the liſts: when a well mounted Georgian appeared againſt him; but at the firſt career, he unhorſed him, and ſucceſſively three of his ſons, who wiſhed to retrieve the family honour. A champion of uncommon ſize then approached. He was ſurnamed Pil afkun (overthrower of elephants). His blows fell with ſuch force and rapidity, that Jelaleddin, apprehenſive leſt his horſe ſhould fly off, or ſink under him, ſprung to the ground; and aimed his lance with ſuch addreſs, that he pierced the Georgian's forehead, and extended him lifeleſs on the ground. [b]

MANY other circumſtances which accompanied the inſtitution of Chivalry in Europe appear to have been long familiar in the Eaſt: tournaments, throwing the javelin, armorial bearings, and, above all, that reſpectful attention to women, which formed no part of the national character of the Greeks or Romans. The exerciſes of the *geridé* and the *kana* were favourite amuſements with the young warriors. They darted them at the ring *derit*; and they tilted, or threw them at one another. The Arabian conquerors of

BOMBAY BRANCH

Spain carried the custom into that country; where, under the description of *Fiestas de las Canas*, it is celebrated in the *Romanzes*, as one of the highest public entertainments which the gallant Moors gave in honour of the Ladies. One cavalier was the public challenger or Mantenedor. He run at the ring, or tilted with all who entered the lists. Gold chains, jewels, and other rich ornaments were the prizes: but the most valuable of all was, the picture of the Mantenedor's mistress; which was placed in a conspicuous part of field; and surrounded by the portraits of those of the vanquished Knights. The Ladies in galleries, erected round the lists, were generally witnesses of the address, strength, and fortune of their admirers. [c]

THE attention of the Arabians and Tartars to the Fair Sex seems indeed to have been conducted upon such principles of delicate sensibility, as would hardly be expected from that fierceness of temper, for which they have been characterized. Yet the great lines in the manners of those people may nevertheless, in some measure, account for it. Their attachment to pastoral life, ever favourable to love, with many circumstances peculiar to their roving habits, would frequently produce such situations as might greatly heighten that ele-

gant regard for the ſex, which diſtinguiſhes refined affection from brutal impulſe. Many tribes are often encamped together; and the young men of one fall naturally in love with the damſels of another. In the midſt of their courtſhip, the heads of the tribes ſuddenly order the tents to be ſtruck: one goes to the right hand; the other takes the left. The lovers are ſeparated, perhaps never more to meet: and if we can draw any concluſions from their elegies or their language, thoſe ſeparations have been often fatal. Dying for love is conſidered amongſt us as a mere poetic figure; and we certainly can ſupport the reality by few examples: but in Eaſtern countries it ſeems to be ſomething more: many words, in the Arabic and Perſian languages, which expreſs *Love*, implying alſo *Melancholy*, *Madneſs*, and *Death*. [d]

THE military ideas, which prevailed in Old Arabia, ſeem alſo to have been peculiarly calculated to promote a romantic attention to the Fair Sex. A long ceſſation of hoſtilities was painful to the Arabs: their arms were often turned againſt the neighbouring countries, and caravans of travellers; but oftener againſt each other. Captives and plunder were the chief objects; and the women were conſidered as moſt valuable ſpoils. To pro-

ted them became in consequence a great point of honour. Those predatory wars, in whatever light we may view them, were considered as highly honourable in Arabia; and no man was thought in any shape accomplished, who could not boast, in them, some feat of arms. Their expeditions were in general short. If they found the enemy too powerful, they retired; if unprepared, they surprized them; if of equal or inferior force, they attacked them: and one battle was for the most part decisive. A young warrior returning after a short absence, and laying his laurels, his captives, and his spoils at the feet of his mistress, would, in general, woo with success: and he, whose gallant intrepidity had saved his tribe from rapine and captivity, would ever be a favourite of the fair. When the flower of any tribe were absent upon a distant enterprize, some hostile neighbours would often attack those they had left behind: and hence arose perhaps the custom of the Arabian women, even of the highest rank, attending their husbands, fathers, and brothers in their military expeditions; and of fighting often with a degree of heroism not inferior to the fabled atchievements of the ancient Amazons. We have many instances of the fortune of the day

having been restored by them after the men had fled: but none more remarkable than the famous battle of Yermouk, fought in the year 636; which proved decisive of the fate of Syria, and of the Greek Empire in the East. The Grecians greatly out-numbered the Arabians; and their onset was so impetuous, that they drove them to their tents. There the fugitives were stopt by the women; who alternately encouraged and reproached them: they threatened even to join the Greeks; and one of their bravest officers appearing disposed for flight, a lady knocked him down with a tent pole; saying, "Advance, Paradise is before your face; fly, "and the fire of hell is at your back." The chief women then took the command; and made head till night parted the combatants. The next day they led them again to the attack; a young lady, named *Khaula*, sister to one of the principal commanders, acting as general. In leading the van she was beat to the ground by a Greek; when *Wafeira*, one of her female friends, striking off his head at a blow, brought the heroine off. Animated by the noble behaviour of the women, the Arabs soon became irresistible, and routed at length the Grecian army, with the loss, it is said, of 150,000 killed, and about 50,000

prisoners. Khaula was afterwards espoused by the Khalif Ali.—The Arabian women were, in general, excellent archers; and they watched every opportunity of revenging the death of their husbands, their fathers, their brothers, or their lovers. The governor of Damascus, a man of uncommon abilities and courage, killed with his own hand, in a sally, an Arabian of distinction, named Aban, in the sight of his wife, who fought by his side. She immediately let fly an arrow, which missing the governor, killed the great standard-bearer: with the second she was more successful; she wounded him in the eye, and forced him to retreat to Damascus.

The Tartars, as we are informed in the History of Abulgasi Khan, used in the same manner, to carry with them, when they went even upon short expeditions, their wives and families, for the reasons mentioned above; as that weaker sex must, otherwise, have remained, in the absence of the warriors, a prey to invading neighbours.—Tamerlane, in the intervals between his expeditions, used to assemble all the young females of the army, and order a general marriage; which he solemnized with uncommon magnificence. After the defeat of the Kipjaks about the year 1389, that prince gave a most

pompous feaſt in the delightful plains near Samarcand, on the marriage of his Emirs, his inferior officers, and his ſoldiers; which was introduced by a grand piece of muſic, compoſed on the occaſion, called the *Triumph of Kipjak.* He was ſeated on a throne of gold: rich carpets and brocades overſpread the ground: and tables in various diſpoſitions were ranged around to an immenſe diſtance: thoſe of the great Emirs being placed next to the throne; and the ſubordinate officers and ſoldiers ſeated according to their reſpective ranks, marſhalled in battle array; the bridegrooms on one ſide, and the brides on the other. Thoſe gallant entertainments, which were accompanied with tournaments, huntings, and various hardy ſports, coincided perfectly with the genius of his people. They often continued many days; for all the great Khans were ambitious of imitating the ſplendor of their ſovereign: and he took pains to encourage their ruling paſſion. No prince was ever more generous to thoſe who ſerved him well: yet he knew the ſecret of keeping even the richeſt dependent on his bounty; and Luxury was the maſter-key. War and the Ladies he knew were the great objects of their adoration. They fought and they plundered, only to be gallant and magnificent.

The marriage of a prince among the Tartars was attended with ſingular ſplendor and ceremony. I ſhall not dwell upon numberleſs inſtances which might be brought from the Hiſtories of Jengiz Khan, Tamerlane, Abulgaſi, and other Tartar annals, but ſhall only remark a pompous cuſtom, mentioned by the Vizir Nezam, which I have met with in no other author. It is introduced when occaſionally mentioning ſome particulars of the marriage of his ſovereign, the Sultan *Malekſhah*, with the daughter of the Khalif. "The Sultan was encamped on the "weſt ſide of the Tigris; and the Khalif's "palace was on the eaſt. On the day choſen "for the ceremony, the Sultan gave orders, "that all the Great Men who were preſent "ſhould go to the palace of the Khalif to ſo-"licit his conſent: *for according to the cuſ-"tom of the Turcomans, at the time of the "courtſhip, the Bridegroom's people go to the "father of the future Bride; and in a ſuppli-"cating manner requeſt him to give his conſent "to the match.* In like manner, the great "men, then aſſembled from moſt parts of "the earth, went in proceſſion to ſupplicate "the Khalif: and, to ſhow the regard due to "his palace, directions were given, that they "ſhould all go thither on foot. When they

" began to march, the Khalif, who had no-
" tice of their motion, immediately sent a
" messenger, who said, that the Commander
" of the Faithful had ordered *Nezam ul mulk*
" to come on horseback. So I alone mount-
" ed; and all the great men of the world
" accompanied me on foot. On our arrival
" at the palace, I was introduced into a most
" magnificent hall: and seated on an eminent
" place: and all the rest on my right and
" left. Then robes of honour were brought
" for all of us: and, on that for me, was curi-
" ously wrought the following words, *For*
" *the Wise and Just Vizir Nezam ul Mulk,*
" *Emiru'l'mouminin.* And from the begin-
" ning of Mohammedanism to this day no
" Vizir has been dignified with the title of
" Prince of the Faithful."—The high respect paid by the Tartars to the Sex might indeed be supported upon many grounds.—If a Tartar chief married several wives, the sons of the lady, who was most nobly born, took precedence of their elder brothers, whose mothers were of inferior rank. It is particularly remarked, as a general Mogul custom, by *Abulpharaj*, when mentioning the sons of Jengiz Khan, by his principal queen Owisunjin Begum, daughter of Thogrul Khan or Prester John; and seems to be a stretch of

complaisance unknown even in our European laws).—The Vizir Nezam advises his son, if he accepts, the Vizirship, to pay uncommon attention to the Ladies of the court, for the following reason: "Although, in old times, "especially during the reigns of the ancient "Kings of Persia, no great regard was paid "to the opinion of the Queens in matters of "state; yet the Khans of Turkestan had al- "ways a custom of consulting the women on "all emergencies; and preferred their opini- "ons to that of all their counsellors: and as "the Turcoman princes were originally edu- "cated among them, they likewise follow this "custom; and trust to their prudent advice "on all occasions. It is therefore absolutely "necessary that you take shelter under their "protection." As Nezam always illustrates his advice by some anecdote from History, or his own observation, he, upon this occasion, gives some instances of the great influence and address of a lady called *Jemila Candahari*, the favourite attendant on the young Tartar queen of Sultan Mahmoud; who appears, from the account of this penetrating statesman, to have been the chief though secret spring of every ministerial movement. She was handsome; and endowed with uncommon parts: she was a steady friend, and a determined but not a

cruel enemy. She protected her favourites in the most dangerous situations; and hurled, with a sure but invisible arm, disappointment and disgrace on the heads of those who wished to rise upon their ruin. [s]

SECT. VI.

Conjectures on Eastern Music.

I HAVE mentioned a musical composition performed before Tamerlane, called the *Triumph of Kipjak*; but I have had no opportunity of discovering any thing satisfactory of the genius of the Tartar, Persian, or Arabian music. They have however three principal *perdes* or modes; called the *Ispahani*, which appears to be the original Persian melody; the *Iraki* or the Babylonish; and the *Hejazi* or the Arabian: which have probably an analogy and a difference, similar to that which is found between the aboriginal music of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Their stile is apparently not very remote from that which prevailed in Europe before the eleventh century; when Guido and others began to improve the Italian taste. Simple melody seems to be their only object; without any idea of composition in score, or of harmonic accompaniment; excepting what

may be produced, by the concord of a deep-toned instrument playing the same piece along with another, tuned a single or a double octave higher. But this approaches so near to unison, as hardly to suggest any idea of that variety introduced by thirds, fifths, and the other less perfect chords; which so remarkably distinguishes the present European system from that of the ancients. — The Asiatics have a great number of instruments; and many of those now in use amongst us, tho' considerably improved, appear to have been originally of Eastern invention. One of their most favourite instruments is called the *Barbut*; a species of lute, which is said to have been invented by a famous musician of that name, who was master to Khosrou Parviz, king of Persia, about the end of the sixth century: but it is probable that he only improved it; and was perhaps so surnamed, from his excellent performance on the instrument. For the *Barbiton*, which, in name and description, seems to have borne a great resemblance to it, was known to the Greeks; though it might possibly have been originally brought from Persia; Strabo observing, that it was so named, as being borrowed from Barbarians. Among the Eastern nations we find a variety of instruments of this species; which bear a pro-

portion, in point of ſize, ſimilar to that of the violin, tenor, and violoncello, in Europe. The *Abèr* ſeems to be a common lute; the *Sìli* is deſcribed with a large ſwelling belly, and a deep tone. The *Shahſhah* is a four-ſtringed inſtrument, ſomewhat like a violoncello. The *Yenem* is another large inſtrument ſtrung with braſs wires, and ſtruck with a ſhort plectrum; the *Yeſhkirdé* being ſomewhat ſimilar, but played with a long bow. The *Sheſhta* has ſix ſtrings, and is of the ſame ſpecies with the *Kitar*; whence our guitar, from the Spaniſh *guitarra*, ſeems to have been borrowed: as it was a favourite inſtrument with the Arabian conquerors of Spain; who ſeem not only to have introduced it, but alſo the gallant cuſtom of ſerenading their miſtreſſes: on which occaſion, not only the words of their ſongs, but the airs, and even the colour of their habits, were expreſſive of the triumph of the fortunate, or the deſpair of the rejected lover. *

THE Perſians appear to have been the moſt muſical of the Eaſtern nations; the Arabians themſelves, who have written many treatiſes on the ſubject, acknowledging, that they had borrowed from them the greateſt part of their knowledge, and many of their terms of art. Father Angelo ſays that he ſaw ſeveral beautiful muſical manuſcripts at Iſphahan;

some of which were brought into Europe, and placed in the library of Louis XIV. by his Oriental interpreter M. Petis Le Croix. [b]

The great men in the East have been always fond of music. Tho' prohibited by the Mohammedan religion, it in general makes part of every public or private entertainment. Female slaves are generally kept to amuse them, and the ladies of their Harams. Female strolling musicians are also very common; and the Persian *Khanyageré* seems nearly to have resembled our old English Minstrel; as he generally accompanied his Barbut or lute with heroic songs.—Their musicians appear, like old Timotheus, to have known the art of moving the passions, and to have generally directed their music to the heart. I shall mention one instance. Alfarabi, who died about the middle of the tenth century, was a philosopher of uncommon genius; and, amongst other accomplishments, he excelled in music. On his return from the pilgrimage to Mecca, he introduced himself, though a stranger, at the court of Seifeddoula, Sultan of Syria. Musicians were accidentally performing, and he joined them. The prince admired him, and wished to hear something of his own. He pulled a composition from his pocket, and distributing the parts amongst

the band, the first movement threw the prince and his courtiers into violent and incessant laughter; the next melted all into tears; and the last lulled even the performers asleep. [c]

SECT. VII.

Private war among the Eastern nations compared with that which prevailed in Europe during the middle ages. Compositions for homicide. The holy months of the Arabians contrasted with the Treuga Dei, and Pax Regis of Europe. Captivity and Slavery.

A VARIETY of customs, we may here observe, prevailed amongst the independent tribes of Pagan Arabians and Tartars, which were either abolished or modified, when they became united under princes of ability and power. One of these was the destructive system of Private War. In every state where the arm of the civil magistrate has been too feeble to check or chastise the crimes of men, private revenge seems naturally to have usurped the place of legal punishment. We find it in full vigour in the middle ages, and universally adopted in every European state. And

ſo forcible is the prejudice of ancient habit, that even where ſovereigns gained ſtrength ſufficient, to ſubſtitute the laws of reaſon for the practices of barbarity, they found it not prudent to overturn at once this pernicious offspring of uncultivated minds: but, by loading it with expenſive compoſitions, they endeavoured to make its ravages leſs hurtful to ſociety. Similar but more ſavage principles appear to have regulated thoſe Eaſtern nations. If an Arabian had loſt a near relation, a wife, or even a ſlave, he ſingled out from among the Captives, when victorious, a freeman for each, and ſacrificed them in cold blood. This was not conſidered as barbarous: it was rather a point of honour; which avarice alone appears to have mitigated: the huſband, relations, or maſter of the deceaſed, being permitted to diſpenſe with their ſanguinary vengeance, in conſideration of a mulct. We accordingly find, about the birth of Mohammed, that ten camels were the compenſation for a ſlaughtered man; without any apparent diſtinction between the freeman and the ſlave. Mohammed, powerful as he was, durſt not, any more than the lawgivers of Europe, ſo far oppoſe the general genius of the people, as entirely to aboliſh this brutal cuſtom: but he endeavoured to mitigate or regulate it by ſe-

veral passages in the Alcoran; in which, among other circumstances, a distinction is made of rank and sex. In after-times, the composition of ten camels was found inadequate to check the prevalence of private vengeance: and, in the Sonna, it was accordingly raised to a hundred: probably for the same reasons which dictated an encrease of the sanguinary fines among the Lombards and other European nations: because those fines having been originally fixed when the people were poor; they were found too trifling, when, by the extent of their conquests, they had become powerful and rich. It does not however appear, that any thing similar to the European *Fredum*, or proportion paid to the public treasury, subsisted among the Eastern nations; the whole of the compensation being received by the relations or master of the slaughtered person. In the East, as well as in Europe, the relations of the principals in a quarrel seem to have been bound by honour and custom to espouse their party, and to revenge their death; one of the highest reproaches, with which one Arabian could upbraid another, being an accusation of having left the blood of his friend unrevenged. The sacred months of the Arabians appear to have been far superior to the *Treuga Dei* or the *Pax Regis*

of Europe. Three following months in every year, with another one intermediate, muſt have tended far more effectually to ſoften exaſperated minds, than the interval of three days in a week; which would, in general, only give them a breathing time to prepare for freſh hoſtilities. Thoſe European ordinances were, at the ſame time, too often diſregarded; whilſt in Arabia, they took the heads from their ſpears, and obſerved this great ſalutary law ſo religiouſly, that from the earlieſt periods of record or tradition, they furniſhed but four or five inſtances where it had been infringed; and theſe were ſtamped with the epithet of impiety, and the univerſal execration of the people. *

One circumſtance, however, appears ſtrongly to have diſtinguiſhed the private wars in the Eaſt from thoſe of the Weſt. The manners of Aſia ſeem, in all ages, to have pointed to domeſtic ſlavery: and Mohammed, in Arabia, made that an article of religion, which had anciently been only a cuſtom. The Captives were, in conſequence, with few exceptions, conſtantly reduced to a ſtate of ſervitude; and little diſtinction ſeems, in general, to have been made between a princeſs and her female ſlave; excepting what ſhe derived from a ſuperiority of perſonal accompliſhments. Thoſe

ideas the Arabians retained amidſt their extenſive conqueſts. Many inſtances might be given; but I ſhall confine myſelf to two; as they regard the daughters of the two greateſt princes then in the world.—In an action after the ſiege of Damaſcus, in 635, amongſt other priſoners was the daughter of Heraclius, Emperor of Greece, and widow of the Governor of that city. Rafi, the Arabian commander, to whoſe lot ſhe fell, preſented her, without ceremony, as a ſlave, to Jonas, a Grecian, who had embraced the Mohammedan religion; but Jonas, from a principle of honour, returned her, with all her jewels, unranſomed to her father.—When the Arabians conquered Perſia, Shirin Banu, the daughter of king Yezdejird, was one of the captives, and was publicly expoſed to ſale in the city of Medina; but the liberal-minded Ali thought differently from his countrymen on this occaſion: he declared, that the offspring of princes ought not to be ſold: and married her immediately to his ſon Hoſſain. This anecdote I met with in the mutilated manuſcript, formerly mentioned, the author of which I have not been able to diſcover. Iſmael Sefi, who mounted the throne of Perſia in the year 1502, derived his deſcent, as obſerved before, (p. 73.) from the Khalif Ali; and as he claimed re-

lationſhip to the ancient royal family of Perſia, it was probably in conſequence of this marriage. What may ſerve to confirm this anecdote, is a ſtory related of the Khalif Al Walid, and the Imam Zein Alabdin, ſon of Hoſſain, whom he ſuſpected of a deſign upon the Khalifat. "You are unworthy to reign, "ſaid Al Walid, as being the ſon of a ſlave: "your mother was one of the Perſian captives." The Imam anſwered, "The mother of Iſmael, the ſon of Abraham, was "the ſlave Hagar; yet Mohammed was deſcended from her." The Khalif bluſhed, and was ſilent. [b]

The Tartars, in the circumſtance of private war, reſembled, in many particulars, the old Arabians; in ſome they differed. The whole hiſtory of Abulgazi Khan is filled with the inceſſant wars of the various tribes. The domeſtic ſlavery of the men was, indeed, ſeldom adopted. They either maſſacred them, or ſent them into diſtant exile: but the women were made captives. Abulgazi mentions particularly, when the princes of the tribe of Amunak, about the year 1504, defeated the poſterity of Burga Sultan, one of the deſcendants of Jengiz Khan, that they put to death all the males of that houſe; but their wives and daughters they kept as ſlaves. When they

ſpared their priſoners, and either ſet them at liberty, or removed them to another country, they divided them into ſmall troops of ten or twelve; each of which furniſhed one, as a hoſtage for the good behaviour of the reſt. A ſimilar cuſtom prevailed of old among the Germans.[c]

SECT. VIII.

Generoſity and Hoſpitality of the Aſiatics.

AMIDST all the vices and dangerous qualities of the Arabians, Perſians, and Tartars, they have been ever diſtinguiſhed for generoſity and hoſpitality. Particular details would be endleſs; they are to be found in almoſt every author who has touched upon the hiſtory of thoſe people. I ſhall only obſerve, in addition to thoſe accounts, that there is hardly a word in the Arabic and Perſian languages which ſignifies *Avarice*, that does not alſo imply *Cowardice*, *baſeneſs*, *ſlavery*, or *villainy*. The Arabians have even a proverb, that no Miſer was ever brave, but the Khalif Abdalla ben Zobair. So high is their idea of

the rights of hoſpitality, that if the murderer of their deareſt friends had, even by chance, eaten or drunk under their roof, that alone cancelled every former crime; and they were bound not only to forgive but to protect him. The wretch, who had betrayed the man, whoſe bread he had eaten, was juſtly ſtamped with the deepeſt infamy; a *Bread and Salt Traitor* being one of the moſt opprobrious epithets by which one Aſiatic could expreſs his deteſtation of another.—Their veneration for Salt is indeed extraordinary. A robber having one night broke into the palace of the king of Sejeſtan; and happening, whilſt he was making off with his rich booty, to tread upon a ſtone, which he conceived to be a jewel that had eſcaped his ſearch in the dark, he picked it up; and, putting it to his mouth, to be ſatisfied of the truth, he found it to be ſalt. This accidental circumſtance operated ſo forcibly, even with this looſe-principled man, that he then, conſidered his robbery as a violation of the rights of hoſpitality; and retired immediately home without his plunder. This famous robber became afterwards king of Sejeſtan, and founder of the dynaſty of the Soffarides.—A cuſtom ſubſiſts to this day in India, among the Gentoos, of taſting Salt, together with other ceremonies,

when dividing property among partners, or the heirs of a perſon deceaſed. *

SECT. XI.

The Trial by Ordeal apparently of Perſian Origin.

AMONGST other laws and uſages, ſimilar to thoſe of the Northern nations, we find, that the trial by Ordeal was anciently known in Perſia; and it originated apparently from their ſuperſtitious veneration for Fire. After exalting that element to the rank of a divinity, we cannot wonder that they ſhould reſort to it, for evidence, in points which could not admit of poſitive proof. In the *Shah namé* we find the deſcription of an illuſtrious trial, by the Ordeal, above five hundred years before the Chriſtian era. Siavekhſh, ſon of the reigning king Kai Kaus, had been educated in Sejeſtan by the great Roſtam. His father, hearing much of his accompliſhments, ſent for him to court; where Saudabé, his mother-in-law, fell in love with him. She ſoon made a declaration; but, the prince diſcouraging her advances, ſhe flew in a rage to

the king, and accused him of an attempt upon her honour. The prince protested his innocence; but the queen persisted, and demanded justice. The king knew not how to decide; the nature of the case could not admit of proof. He ordered, therefore, a large fire to be kindled, and the parties to pass through it. The prince, without hesitation, boldly entered it on horseback, and passed unhurt. But Saúdabé trembled, and durst not venture: she fell on her knees, confessed the truth, and was pardoned on the generous intercession of the man she meant to destroy. Though the whole of this anecdote may be fiction, as part of it undoubtedly is, still I must repeat, that Firdousi would not have mentioned this mode of trial, had it been unknown in Persia.—The trial by Ordeal, where satisfactory evidence cannot be obtained, is still in practice among the Gentoos in Hindostan; and is of high antiquity. It is mentioned several times in the *Code of Gentoo Laws*, as a common mode of proof, under the title of *Purrikeh*: but I have not been able to discover the particular species which they adopt.

SECT. X.

On the Adminiſtration of Juſtice in the Eaſt.

THE adminiſtration of juſtice in Pagan Arabia appears to have been very ſimple; the heads of the tribes being, in general, the umpires of every difference. Solemn oaths uſed to be taken over a fire called *hawlet*; into which, if they ſuſpected a witneſs of perjury, they privately threw a ſpecies of ſalt; which making a ſudden exploſion, terrified him often into a diſcovery of the truth. Over a fire they uſed alſo to make treaties and other ſolemn agreements. — After Mohammed had eſtabliſhed his prophetic character, cauſes appear to have been determined only by him and his chief companions: and their decrees were ſometimes ſtrikingly deciſive. A Mohammedan being caſt in a ſuit with a Jew before the tribunal of the Prophet, appealed to Omar; who happened to be ſtanding at his door when the parties appeared. After liſtening to the merits with great compoſure, he bid them wait a little, and he would ſoon ſettle the whole affair. He then went into

his houſe, and returning inſtantly with a ſword, ſtruck off the Mohammedan's head: "Thus, ſays he, ought all to be puniſhed, "who acquieſce not in the ſentence of the "prophet of God."

I FOUND a deciſion of Ali, in the imperfect manuſcript formerly mentioned, which ſeems ingenious, and ſhows, at the ſame time, ſomething of the manners of the people in thoſe times. Two Arabians ſat down to dinner: one had five loaves, the other three. A ſtranger paſſing by, deſired permiſſion to eat with them; which they agreed to. The ſtranger dined, laid down eight pieces of money, and departed. The proprietor of the five loaves took up five pieces, and left three for the other; who objected, and inſiſted for one half. The cauſe came before Ali, who gave the following judgment: "Let the "owner of the five loaves have ſeven pieces "of money; and the owner of the three "loaves, one: for if we divide the eight "loaves by three, they make twenty-four "parts; of which he who laid down five "loaves, had fifteen; whilſt he who laid "down three, had only nine: as all fared "alike, and eight ſhares was each man's pro-"portion, the ſtranger ate ſeven parts of the "firſt man's property, and only one belong-

"ing to the other: the money, in juſtice, "muſt be divided accordingly." [b]

In after times, in the various Mohammedan ſtates, the Law appears to have been ſtrangely perverted; and the ſatiriſts are, in conſequence, uncommonly ſevere. "Formerly, ſays a poet, the judges were naked "ſwords, and the guilty only trembled; now "they are empty ſheaths, and gorge themſelves with the plunder of the ſuitors.— "Are you indigent, ſays another, and have "you the misfortune to be at law with the "rich: withdraw your ſuit; go to your "powerful oppreſſor, and humble yourſelf "in the duſt: there you may perhaps meet "with juſtice and mercy: with the Cadhi "you can have none." And in fact no cenſure appears ever to have been more juſtly grounded; for in the Eaſtern languages, there are not only words ſignifying Bribes to Judges; but others, which denote Men whoſe public and profeſſed employment was, The corrupting of magiſtrates, to procure deciſions contrary to equity and law. We may form indeed a judgment of the general adminiſtration, or rather perverſion, of juſtice, under ſome of the Khalifs, from an appointment of Moctader; who, about the beginning of the tenth century, promoted a young damſel, named

Yemika; to be preſident of *Diwanu'l'mezalim*, one of the principal tribunals of the empire; which took cognizance of the tyranny and oppreſſion of governors and other great men.[c]

The following curious anecdote is told, in the Negariſtan, of a famous lawyer of Baghdad, called Abu Joſeph. It marks ſeveral peculiarities in the Mohammedan law, and diſplays ſome caſuiſtical ingenuity in adapting them to the views of his clients. The Khalif Haron Arraſhid had taken a fancy for a female ſlave belonging to his brother Ibrahim. He offered to purchaſe her; but Ibrahim, though willing to oblige his ſovereign, had ſworn, that he would neither ſell nor give her away. As all parties wiſhed to remove this difficulty, Abu Joſeph was conſulted; who adviſed Ibrahim to give his brother one half of the ſlave, and to ſell him the other. Happy to be relieved from this embarraſſment, the Khalif ordered 30,000 dinars for the moiety of the ſlave; which Ibrahim, as a mark of his acknowledgment, immediately preſented to the lawyer. But a ſecond difficulty now aroſe. The Moſlem law prohibits all commerce between a man and the wife or concubine of his brother, till ſhe has been re-married and divorced by a third perſon. Abu Joſeph adviſed the Khalif to marry her to one of his

ſlaves; who, for a proper conſideration, would be eaſily induced to repudiate her on the ſpot. The ceremony was inſtantly performed: but the ſlave, falling in love with his handſome ſpouſe, could not be prevailed upon to conſent to a ſeparation. Here was a ſtrange and unexpected dilemma; for, all deſpotic as the Khalif was, he durſt not compel him. But Abu Joſeph ſoon diſcovered an expedient. He deſired the Khalif to make a preſent to the lady of her new huſband, which virtually diſſolved the marriage; as no woman, by the Mohammedan law, can be the wife of her own ſlave. Overjoyed that the Gordian knot was thus ſo ingeniouſly unlooſed, the Khalif gave him 10,000 dinars; and the fair ſlave receiving a conſiderable preſent from her royal lover, preſented him with 10,000 more: ſo that Abu Joſeph, in a few hours, found his fees amount to 50,000 dinars, or nearly 25,000 l. [d]

To thoſe ſtrictures many might be added: but I am already led too far; and time obliges me to conclude. The ſubjects touched upon, in this Diſſertation, are various; and ſome of them may be diſcovered, perhaps, to have been too ſlightly conſidered. I have differed freely from very high authorities; but, ſenſible how much eaſier it is to point out errors

than to avoid them, I ſubmit myſelf as freely to the deciſion of every intelligent reader. Be it delivered with the temper of the gentleman and the ſcholar, I ſhall be proud of every ingenious criticiſm; and endeavour to improve by a diſcovery of my faults. I am not attached to a ſingle idea that may be found inconſiſtent with truth or propriety; and ſhould, with far leſs pain, ſee the moſt favourite theory fall before a judicious inveſtigation, than be juſtly cenſured for a failure in candour or politeneſs.

PROOFS

AND

ILLUSTRATIONS.

Page 2. [a] AMONGST other proofs which I propose to offer in the course of this disquisition, one appears to me to be of high authority; I mean radical words in the Eastern tongues, expressive of peculiar habits, or inventions; the existence of the terms being positive evidence of the pre-existence of the objects which they describe. In this mode of proof I shall advance no words which appear to have been adopted from the Grecian or other foreign languages; as these could demonstrate no originality: and I shall avoid all circumlocutory description, as that can prove no antiquity. Whatever is expressed by a number of words, we shall, for the most part, find, is neither perfectly nor generally known: it is only when the idea has become familiar, that the superfluity of phrase is dropt, and the principal word becomes sufficient to make the whole completely understood.

P. 3. [b] See this Dissertation, Chap. ii.

P. 4. [c] St. Ephraim and St. Basil insist that the Aramean or Mesopotamian dialect of the Syriac, was that in which God delivered his commands to Adam; the Maronites, or Eastern Christians, contend for the Chaldaic; James Bishop of Roha, Bochart, and others, give the precedence to the Hebrew; Eutychius supports the Greek;

Mr. Webb the Chinese; Goropius Becanus and Pezron are warm for the Teutonic; whilst Gregory Nyssaeus declares his antagonist Eunomius an impious heretic, for supposing Man to have received any language whatever from God. See also D'Herbelot Bibliotheque Orientale, p. 514. Sharpe on the Origin of Languages, p. 2. 6. &c. —The learned Bochart has given us a list of about twenty languages, supposed to have been in use in very early ages; and has arranged them, with regard to antiquity, in the following order: The Hebrew, the Chaldaic or Syriac, the Arabic, Phœnician, Egyptian, the Azotian or Philistine, the Persian, Parthian, Median, Elamite, Cappadocian, Pontic, Asiatic, Phrygian, Pamphilian, Libyan, Cretan, and Lycoanic, together with the Greek and Latin; all of which (the three first, the Persian, and two last excepted) were, probably, only dialects of the principal tongues. See Bochart, Phaleg, p. 47. &c.

P. 5. [d] See Preface to Arabic Lexicon of Golius, p. 1. Sale's Preliminary Discourse to his translation of the Alcoran, p. 33. et seq.

P. 6. [e] D'Herbelot, p. 513 and 514. Sale's Preliminary Discourse, p. 37, &c.

P. 7. [f] The seven principal Moallakat Poems are in Pocock's Collection in the Bodleian Library of Oxford, N° 164. And in another volume, N° 174. are above forty more, which had been also honoured by being hung up in the Kaaba.

P. 8. [g] The subjects of Amralkeis revolting from him, he took refuge at Ancyra in Galatia; where he died, according to some Mohammedan writers, in consequence of wearing a poisoned shirt, sent to him by Heraclius Emperor of Greece, who had taken offence at some satires supposed to have been levelled at him by that prince.

P. 9. [h] Pocock, in his Preface to the *Carmen Tograi*, mentions a circumſtance which may give ſome idea of the pains which the Arabians have taken with their language. A king having ſent to a grammarian for the books in his poſſeſſion relative to that tongue, he deſired the meſſenger to inform the monarch, that, if he wiſhed to have them, he muſt ſend ſixty camels to carry the dictionaries alone. The Arabians, like the Greeks, were extremely attentive to poliſh their language, and turn their periods: a rhythmical cadence, called سجع *ſuja*, being in general ſtrictly obſerved in all their beſt orations and proſe writings. The claſſical Arabic has received no change ſince Mohammedaniſm; nor for many years before.

P. 9. [i] مولي *moula* from the ſame root ولي *veli* ſignifies A prince, &c. and alſo A ſlave.

P. 10. [k] Sale's Preliminary Diſcourſe, p. 34. D'Herbelot 87, 589. and 705. Tarikhu'l'moſlemin, i. e. Hiſtoria Saracenica Thomæ Erpenii, p. 193. &c. Preface to Carmen Tograi by Pocock. Arabic Grammar by the author of this Dictionary, p. 4.—The vizir Moklah had his hand afterwards cut off, on being convicted of a conſpiracy: when he upbraided the court for cutting off that hand which had been ſo uſeful and ornamental to learning.

P. 13. [a] By Pliny, Zoroaſter is called a Proconneſian; by Suidas, an Aſſyrian and Medo-Perſian; by others, he is ſtiled a Pamphylian, an Armenian, a Bactrian, an Indian, and a Chineſe. His era is ſtill more wide of poſſibility than his birth-place: Pliny (l. 30. c. 1.) places him him thouſands of years before Moſes: Hermadorus Platonicus, Hermippus, and Plutarch, 5000 years before the ſiege of Troy: Suidas, only 500 years before that period: Eudoxas, 6000 years before the death of Plato (which happened about 350 before Chriſt): Xanthus Lydius

600 years before Darius Hyſtaſpes. Juſtin, 1300 years before Sardanapalus: whilſt others fix him in the days of Ninus and Semiramis, who ſeem to be equally undefined with himſelf. Some Eaſtern writers place Zerduſht 1300 years after the flood: ſome make him the diſciple of Elija or Eliſha; others of Ozair, Ezra, or Eſdras. Some conſider him as Abraham: others as the uſurper Zohak: and ſome, according to D'Herbelot, (from the name *Mikhguſh*, which occurs in the *Tarikh Montekheb*) have conceived him to have been Smerdus Magus. But the greater number make him cotemporary with Kiſhtaſb, king of Perſia; and, conſequently, ſuppoſe him to have lived near 500 years before the Chriſtian era. See alſo D'Herbelot, p. 932. Hyde Religio Vet. Perſ. 312. 423. 443. et paſſim. Bryant's Mythology, Vol. II. p. 106. Univerſal Hiſt. (fol. edit.) Vol. II. p. 204. Jones's Hiſtory of the Perſian language, ſubjoined to his Life of Nadir Shah, p. 157. Chardin, Tom. V. chap. iii.

P. 13. [b] The Arabic words *Dounia* the world; *Min din* from religion; *Zeman* time; *Sanat* a year; *Molk* a king; *Ganm* cattle; *Lelia* night; *Ab* a father; *Am* a mother; *Zamam* compleated; and a variety more occur repeatedly in different parts of M. Anquetil's Zend Aveſta.

P. 14. [c] The following and ſimilar words could hardly ever have been articulated by a Perſian: *Rethvanmtché*, *Khſchetreiao*, *Iaerienmtché*, *Thvoreſchtara*, *Veretreghnhetché*. For the ſatisfaction of thoſe who are converſant with the the modern Perſian, I ſhall here inſert the beginning of the *Vendidad Sadé*, with the Latin tranſlation which M. Anquetil has annexed; and leave them to determine whether (one or two modern words excepted) there ſubſiſts the leaſt affinity between them.

Pe nanmé Iezdann: Pavan schaméh dadar Anhouma: frestoié setéônem setéômé eschem vôhou sé fréoûérâné mezdëiesnô Zeréthoschtresch vidéeoûo Ehoré dekéescho dâtâé hadé dâtâé vîdéoûâé Zeréthoschtrâé eschéoné eschéhé rethvé iesnâétché vehmaétché kheschnéothrâétché frese-teïéetché rethvanm éïérenanmtché asnïenanmtché mâhïé-nanmtché iaerïenanmtché serédénanmtché i. v. kh. s. djé khoschnoumen betha hoêté parié Sreoschéhé eschïéhé tokméhé tenomanthréhé dreschîdresch.

In nomine Dei. In nomine justi judicis Ormuzd. effusè precor animam, effusè precor. puro abundantia 3 ire facio τῦ Ormusd cultor Zoroastrianus cui adversatur Dew τῦ Ormusd responsum, dato huic dad vendi Zoroastri puro sancto magno izeschné (ago) néaesch (ago) placere cupio, vota facio. temporibus diebus, τοῖς gahan, mensibus, τοῖς gahanbar, annis i. n. p. v. quodcumque khoschnoumen sedens sit, lege. τῷ Serosch puro valido corpori obedienti gloria (τῦ Ormusd fulgenti). Zend Avesta Vol. I. part ii, p. 77.

P. 16. [d] The Persian, in point of regularity, is perhaps not to be excelled by any language in the world. As one general rule, the third person of the present tense ends in د *d*; the only exceptions, which I can at present recollect, being است *est* and هست *hest*, He is. In the Zend, on the contrary, the terminations of this person are irregular to the last degree. I shall mention a few examples. *Aschti*, *enghem*, *eoûed*, *heeté*, *beeuad*, il est. *Eenetôed*, *eenetôesch apeouteeé*, il connoit. *Djemad*, *gueteen*, il vient. *Djemeeté* il arrive. *Djeto*, *ghnad*, il frappe. *Snes* il frappe; il brule. *Veiozoschtao* il fait. *Eschto* il s'applique. *Reso* il arrange. *Guethad* il saute. *Mostemescho* il meurt.—In which few words, exclusive of the want of similarity in the penults,

and antepenults, there are no less than eight variations in the final letters. Were it of consequence, many more could be brought.

P. 17. [e] *Ormuzd* (Omnipotence) and *Zoroaster* are introduced in dialogue. The lawgiver wishes to know how a man should get rid of a demon called *Daroudj Nesosch*, supposing him, in the shape of a fly, to have taken possession of the crown of his head; *Ormuzd* directs him to wash the part, which would drive the fiend between the eyebrows; from thence he is to be forced, by another ablution, to the back of the head; from that to the ear, then to the nose, the mouth, the chin: till at length, fighting every inch of ground, the poor devil is successively driven over every part of the body, till we find him stationed on the left foot; when Zoroaster thus proceeds in his catechism; (what is between hooks being M. Anquetil's explanatory interpolations, and not in the original).

"Lorsque l'eau a atteint le dessus du pied gauche où se "retire le Daroudj Nesosch? Ormuzd respondit: (le Da-"roudj Nesosch) sous la forme d'une mouche se place des-"sous le pied; il faut le lever, laissant les doigts poser à "terre, et laver ainsi le dessous du pied droit. Lorsque "l'on a lavé le dessous du pied droit, le Daroudj Nesosch "se retire sous le pied gauche. Lorsque l'on a lavé le des-"sous du pied gauche le Daroudj Nesosch sous la forme "d'une mouche, se place dessous les doigts, Laissant donc "(poser à terre) le dessous du pied, on leve les doigts, et "on lave ceux (du pied) droit. Lorsque l'on a lavé les "doigts du pied droit, le Daroudj Nesosch se retire sous "ceux (du pied) gauche; et lorsqu'on a lavé les doigts "du pied gauche, le Daroudj Nesosch est reversé (vaincu "et s'en retourne) du côté du Nord, lui qui, sous la

" forme d'une mouche, se place sur (l'homme impur) et " le frappe comme le Djodge (chien) des deserts, detruit " les productions des Dews et leurs demeurs," &c.

When the water has reached to the top of the left foot, where does the Daroudj Nesosch retire? Ormusd replied: (The Daroudj Nesosch) under the form of a fly, places himself under the foot; it must be raised, letting the toes rest on the ground, and thus wash the under part of the right foot. When the under part of the right foot is washed, the Daroudj Nesosch retires under the left foot. When the under part of the left foot is washed, the Daroudj Nesosch, in the form of a fly, places himself under the toes. Allowing the sole of the foot (to rest upon the ground) the toes must be raised, and those of the right (foot) washed. When the toes of the right foot are washed, the Daroudj Nesosch retires under those of the left (foot); and when the toes of the left foot are washed, the Daroudj Nesosch is overthrown (conquered, and returns) towards the north, he who under the shape of a fly places himself upon (the impure man) and strikes him like the *Djodje* (dog) of the desert, destroys the productions of the Dews and their dwellings, &c. Zend Avesta par M. Anquetil du Perron, Vol. I. part. ii. p. 341.——Can human credulity suppose this to be the composition of Zoroaster, or of any man who had pretensions to common sense?

P. 18. [f] In the Preface to the *Farhang Jehanguiri* we are informed, that it was not reckoned elegant in the Deri to use syncopes; the following or similar words being never admitted; as کو (speak thou), رو (go thou), فزودن (to increase), &c. they being always written بکو ، برو and افزودن. The softness of this language, in the opinion of the Asiatics, may be learnt from a popular saying, re-

ported by *Ebn Fekreddin Anju*, author of the above Dictionary, "That the *Deri* and the *Arabic* idioms were the "languages of heaven: God communicating to the angels his milder mandates in the delicate accents of the "first; whilst his stern commands were delivered in the "rapid utterance of the other."

Bahaman or Ardeshir Dirazdest is generally supposed to be Artaxerxes Macrocheir or Longimanus. Ardeshir Dirazdest implies The strong lion with the long hands: an epithet supposed to have been given him on account of the greatness of his power and the extent of his empire. Baharam was contemporary with Theodosius II. emperor of Greece, and is known in Europe by the name of *Varanes* or *Vararanes*.

P. 20. [g] Ardeshir Babegan having entertained some doubts relative to the national religion, ordered the chief priests of the Magi to attend, in order to have them explained; when the king, on proposing his doubts, delivered himself as follows:

نمایند ان بمن تا شك زكیهان
كنم دور و هادیرم دین یزدان
همي خواهم كي زان برهان نمایند
حقیقت بر همه كیهان نمایند

Numayend an bemen ta shek zegeihan
Kunem dur wa hadirem din yezdan
Hemi khahem ki zan burhan numayend
Hekiket ber hemé geihan numayend.

Let them show it to me, that doubt from the world
I may drive far off, and embrace the religion of God.
I wish that by this decision they would show
The truth; to all the world show it.

N. B. هاديرم in the ſecond line is either an old word, now obſolete, or an error; if the laſt, it may be correct-ed by ſubſtituting پذيرم or كيرم, or ſome ſuch ſynony-mous word. See Hyde's Religio Veterum Perſarum, p. 18. It may be proper to obſerve, that, in the Old Perſian mode of writing, every vowel has a diſtinct character: to write in that manner, the above would run as follows;

نومايند ان بامان تا شاك زبكايهان
كونام دور وا هاديرام دين يازدان
هامبي خاواهام كي زان بورهان نومايند
هاقبغات بار هامه كايهان نومايند

All the other paſſages ſcattered through the *Religio*, as *Old Perſian*, are, like the above, ſimply the modern lan-guage in ancient characters.

P. 22. [a] It is aſtoniſhing to conſider the number of miſ-takes into which, in the various lines of literature, the beſt of our European authors are led, by their inattention to the languages and writings of the Eaſt. *Mariana*, the chief hiſtorian of Spain, when introducing the Arabian conqueſt of that country, with an account of the Moham-medan religion, ſays, "Fundador de aquella malvada ſu-"perſticion fue Mahoma Arabe de nacion: el qual por la "mucha proſperidad que tuvo en las guerras, y por deſ-"cuydo del emperador Heraclio, ſe llamò y coronò la Sy-"ria, &c." Vid. tomo primero, p. 311. "The foun-"der of this accurſed ſuperſtition was Mahomet, an Ara-"bian by birth; who, in conſequence of his great ſucceſs "in war, and the negligence of the emperor Heraclius, "declared himſelf king of his nation, and was crowned in "Damaſcus, the moſt noble city of Syria."—In an event

[library stamp]

of some importance to the history of Spain, a Spanish historian should have been better informed: but Mohammed never assumed the dignity of king, and never was at Damascus, nor out of Arabia from the period of his appearance in his prophetic character, excepting in the ninth year of the Hejra (A. D. 630.) when he advanced no farther than Tabuc, half way between Medina and Damascus, and returned after a residence of only three weeks. — Dr. Hyde erroneously places the Persian conquest under the reign of Othman, A. D. 646. See Religio Vet. Pers. p. 23. See also Dictionary سال.

P. 23. [b] The Parsis of Surat, in their *Ravaats*, or collections of traditions, have doomed Alexander to the infernal regions; not for ravaging the country of their ancestors, but for having committed to the flames the *Nosks* or sections of the *Zend Avesta*.

P. 23. [c] Arrian de exped. lib. iii. and vii. Pliny lib. xxviii. cap. 2. For the form of invocation, See Macrobius, in the Secret things of Sammonicus Serenus.

P. 24. [d] See Alcoran, chap. ix.

P. 25. [e] The number of manuscripts supposed to have been burnt, exceeded 500,000. They were distributed as fuel to the keepers of 4000 public baths. Some however are supposed to have been privately saved.

P. 27. [f] See Hyde's Religio Vet. Pers. p. 458. Porta xiv. τῶ Sadder. — Anquetil de Perron, Vol. I. P. 2. p. 401. Vol. II. 117, 118.

The pretended Latin original of Milton's Paradise Lost; and the History of Formosa by the Jew *Psalmanasar*, amongst other literary forgeries, are well known. Psalmanazar invented even a language, sufficienty original, copious, and regular, to impose upon men of very extensive learning. [g] See Dictionary بغداد *Baghdad*.

P. 28. [h] The Khalif Al Tai revived in favour of *Azaduddowla* the title of شاهنشاه *Shahinshah*, which was borne by the ancient kings of Persia. See Erpenius's edition of *Tarikh ul moslemin*, or Historia Saracenica, p. 237.—See also Dictionary under امير *emir*.

P. 29. [i] See Dictionary شاه نامه *Shah namé*. Father Angelo, author the *Gazophylacium Linguæ Persarum*, who went a missionary to the East in 1663, says, p. 199) that the language of the *Shah namé* is considered, in Persia, as the idiom of their ancient kings and heroes; and that it is still spoken in the province of Shirvan, near the Caspian Sea, by a people who live in tents. This, if authentic, furnishes another strong argument, that all the difference between the Ancient and Modern dialects, consists entirely in a diversity of character, and in the present intermixture of the Arabic.

P. 30. [k l m] D'Herbelot Bibliotheque Orientale, p. 105, 812, 983. See also the Negaristan.

P. 33. [n] Amongst many instances of Tamerlane's attention to the encouragement of literature, he presented Firuzbadi, author of an Arabic Dictionary, with 5000 pieces of gold, as a reward for his industry and learning. See Dict. قاموس *kamus*.

P. 35. [o] Many valuable works, of the composition of the last centuries, may nevertheless be scattered over the East; which ingenious and learned travellers may in time discover.

P. 36. [p] *Mahmoud*, Sultan of *Ghezna*, invaded Hindostan twelve times: the first was in the year 1000. The *Ghaurid* dynasty commenced in 1157; and gave way to the *Patans* about the beginning of the thirteenth century.

Babir, the great grandson of Tamerlane, after four invasions, defeated *Ibrahim Lodi*, the last emperor of this race, and mounted the throne in the year 1525. The present Great Mogul is his lineal descendant. —With regard to the prevalence of the Arabic and Persian in the Hindostan or Moors, any person conversant with those languages may be convinced, by running his eye over the vocabularies of the vulgar dialect, which have been published by Messrs. Hadley and Ferguson. In the Nagree and Bengal, nothing has indeed hitherto appeared; my opinion, in respect to them, is founded, therefore, upon the number of words which I have occasionally heard mentioned, as belonging to these idioms, which were, in fact, Arabic. I shall confine myself to one strong example. In the trial of the *Maharajah Nuncomar* for forgery, before the supreme court of judicature at Bengal, one of the interpreters, whose practical knowledge of the Persian and Hindostan languages appears to be uncommonly extensive, being asked by the court, what word the witness, then examined, made use of to express *Bond*; he answers, "*Temasook*, which is "a Persian word; it is *Khut* in the Nagree language." But neither تمسك *temasook* nor خط *khut* are of Persian or Nagree original, being both adopted from the Arabic. [N. B. In the printed trial *Immasook* is the word used, which is an error.] It may also be observed, that many of the witnesses who are examined in the Moors, in the Nagree, and in the Bengal dialects, use a variety of words; as سكه دواة *sicca dewat* A silver ink standish; جواب سوال *jawab sawal* Question and answer, or conversation, (see Trial, p. 53, 54.) with many other words which occur in different parts of the trial. —For the manner in which the Arabic and Persian are incorporated in the Malay, See

Maleischê Spraakunst (a Dutch Grammar of that dialect) by George Henrik Werndly.—The language of the Turks, it may be here observed, is called مولع *muwella*, which literally implies a horse, a bull, or other animal, of different colours; their dialect being a mixture of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian. This name, for the same reason, seems to be also applicable to the languages of India.—Amongst other Arabic and Persian words, which I find technically used in the Code of Gentoo Laws, are (p. 41. 44. 53. &c.) ايام شادي *ayami shadee* Days of marriage. ايام is the plural of the Arabic يوم *yum* A day; and شادي *shadi* is a Persian word signifying Gladness. *Fakeer* A religious mendicant (p. 40. &c.) is derived from the Arabic root فقر Poverty, &c. *Haram* A seraglio, (p. 79.) comes from the root حرم Forbidden, unlawful, &c. *Vakeel* (p. 105.) An agent, administrator, &c. is from the root وكل Committing to another the management of one's affairs. There are many more, as *Musnud*, *reyots*, *ihtimandar*, *shebbi tareekee*, &c. but it is unnecessary to swell this note with a multitude of examples. These furnish a sufficient ground for enquiry; which, I am persuaded, the ingenious Mr. Halhead, to whom we are indebted for the English translation of this Code, will be able fully to investigate, together with many points of more importance: as we are with pleasure informed, (pref. xxxvii.) that he had been happy enough to become acquainted with a Bramin of extensive knowledge, who had undertaken to teach him the Shanscrit language.

P. 38. [a] Though I have taken the liberty of pointing out what I conceive to be mistakes in some very eminent men; yet I should be very uncandid, if I did not acknowledge, that I have, at the same time, derived from them

much information; and from none more than Mr. Bryant's Mythology; D'Herbelot's Bibliotheque Orientale; and Dr. Hyde's Religio Veterum Perſarum. I have often taken the benefit of the reſearches and opinions of thoſe and other learned men: and make this general acknowledgment, where, through haſte or inadvertency, I may have omitted to mention my authorities.

P. 40. [b] Bryant's Mythology; Newton's Chronology; Jackſon's Chronological Antiquities; and in general almoſt every chronologer. They for the moſt part proceed upon ſyſtem; and are all in oppoſition to one another.

P. 41. [c] Bryant's Mythol. Vol. I. p. 130. 145. &c.

[d e f g h i] See this Diſſertation, Chap. I. Sect. ii. Chap. II. Sect. i. ii.

P. 48. [a] See Dict. اعجم *ajim.* D'Herbelot, p. 135. 234. 703. 761.

P. 50. [b] See Sir Iſaac Newton's Chronology, p. 52. et paſſim. Alſo Preface to Jones's Hiſt. of Nadir Shah.

P. 56. [c] *Kings of Perſia according to the Greeks.*

Cyaxares, the ſon of Aſtyages, ante Chr. 610.	Artaxerxes Longimanus.
	Xerxes II.
Darius the Mede.	Sogdianus.
Cyrus.	Darius the Baſtard.
Cambyſes.	Artaxerxes Mnemon.
Smerdis Magus.	Artaxerxes Ochus.
Darius, the ſon of Hyſtaſpes.	Arſes or Arogus.
Xerxes.	Darius Codomannus.
Artabanus.	Alexander, ante Chr. 330.

The above liſt I have given, as the moſt authentic, from Sir Iſaac Newton; Herodotus, Xenophon, Pauſanias; Juſtin, and other hiſtorians, differing ſo remarkably, eſpecially with regard to the names, eras, and acts of the early

kings, that, if it was of the leaſt importance to reconcile them, it would be impoſſible.

Kings of Perſia according to the Perſians.

Kai Kobad, ante Chr. about 600.	Ardeſhir or Bahaman.
Kai Kaus.	Queen Homai.
Kai Khoſrou.	Darab.
Lohoraſb.	Darab II.
Kiſhtaſb.	Eſkander or Alexander, ante Chr. 330.

The כורש *Coreſh* of *Iſaiah*, *Daniel*, &c. does not correſpond with Cyrus, as will be obſerved hereafter.

[d] See Homer Od. Γ v. 69.

P. 60. [e] دارا A *king*. داراب (from the participle of داشتن to *have*, *poſſeſs*, &c. and اب *water*); or perhaps دارا داراب *Dara Darab*, *King Darab*; as *Dara* appears rather to have been a general epithet, like *King*, *Sultan*, &c. than the peculiar name of any individual prince. Any argument drawn thence by Sir Iſaac Newton and others, therefore, that the *Perſian* coins called *Darics*, current in Greece and Aſia Minor, were coined by *Darius the Mede*, after the defeat of *Crœſus*; or, according to ſome, by *Darius the ſon of Hyſtaſpes*, ſeems by no means concluſive; either as to the date of the coinage, or even the exiſtence of thoſe princes: as *Darics* might have been ſtruck by any *Dara* or king of Perſia, as the *Sultanines* might have been coined by any or all of the *Sultans of Egypt*.—هماي *Homai* ſignifies A *bird of Paradiſe*, &c.— روشنا *Roſhana*, in Perſian, ſignifies *Splendor*, &c. and is evidently the *Roxana* of the Greeks.

P. 62. [f] M. D'Herbelot, from this event, and the word *Beizet*, derives the *Bezant* or *Bezantine* wedge of gold;

and not from the town of *Byzantium*, as generally imagined. But this ſeems a conjecture too refined to be juſt. The whole of this ſtory, as far as relates to Philip, it muſt be acknowledged, is to the laſt degree doubtful; being diametrically in oppoſition to the moſt probable and beſt ſupported period of the Hiſtory of Greece. Beſides, had there ever been a tribute of golden eggs impoſed by the Perſians on Philip or any other prince, خايه *khaiyé*, مرغانه *murghané*, or ſome word originally Perſian, would have been uſed; and not بيضة *Beizet*, which, being *Arabic*, muſt only have been introduced into Perſian writings ſubſequent to the Arabian conqueſt. Bibliotheque Orientale, p. 286 and 318.

P. 65. * Many of the ſilver coins of the Aſhcanian kings, commonly called Parthians, bore Greek legends. See Father Eraſmus Froelich in his Elementa Numiſmatica, Tab. xiv. &c. alſo Mr. Foſter on the Parthian epocha, in the Archeologia of the Society of Antiquaries, Vol. III. p. 159. N. B. This learned gentleman (p. 164.) interprets *Arſakas*, *Glory of war*; but he produces no authority; and it does not even appear to be a Perſian word. The name of the founder of this dynaſty is named اشك *Aſhek* by the Aſiatics.

D'Herbelot ſays, (p. 867.) from the authority of Maſſoudi, in a book called Moroujo'l'dhahab, that a collection of old Perſian hiſtorians had been tranſlated into Arabic by an author named Ebn Mocanna.

The celebrated Khondemir obſerves, in the Preface to his Univerſal Hiſtory, "That ſince the age of reaſon and "diſcernment, he had employed his time inceſſantly in the "reading and reſearch after hiſtory, collecting every thing "uſeful and agreeable from the works of the beſt writers:

"when having been invited, by the Emir Ali Shir, to su-"perintend a valuable library, filled particularly with his-"torians, carefully collected at a great expence, he had "there resolved to digest the labours of his life." This learned and magnificent prince was governor of Khorassan about the end of the fifteenth century. His noble library was deposited in the city of Herat.

P. 67—70. [b] [c] Nasser, who is also called Al Nodah, brought, among other things, from Persia, a written romance of the adventures of Rostam and Asfendiar. See D'Herbelot, p. 664. See also Alcoran, chap. 31. A teller of tales, or reciter of histories, is called in Persian نيرنج *nirenj*.—The evening conversations which the Arabians hold, sitting around their tents, are called سمر *semir*.

P. 71, &c. [d] No people in the world are greater genealogists than the Arabians, Persians, and Tartars. One book of Arabian genealogies alone, called اللبوب *allobub* (i. e. the hearts or the purity of the noblesse), exceeds 100 volumes. See Dict انساب *ansab*. See also افراسياب *afrasiab*, ترك *turk*, and سفي *sefi*; and this dissertation, p. 28. and 57. See D'Herbelot under the different articles mentioned in the text. See likewise Abulgazi Khan's Genealogical History of the Tartars, chap. 11.

P. 74. [e] Mahmoud Sebekteghin, Sultan of Ghezna, the most powerful prince of the eleventh century, was the *son* of a Turkish slave. Though a patron of learned men, he seems to have been an exception to the general rule; at least I have not discovered that he aimed at a superior origin, or considered the meanness of his birth as any inconveniency in the government of his empire.

P. 75. [f] [g] A writer called Haji Khalfa, has given us a

catalogue of Oriental historians, to the amount of above 1300. Even private noblemen have been ambitious of being known to posterity; and the memoirs of their houses have been carefully treasured with their archives: a practice which, there is reason to believe, is still universally continued; as we even observe in the discussions relative to the late disputes at Madras: where frequent reference is made to various public and private records, in the possession of the great men of Hindostan; but particularly to a manuscript history of the family of the present Nabob of Arcot, compiled by order of his anceftors when only simple Tartar noblemen. See Letter from Mahommed Ali Chan, Nabob of Arcot, to the Court of Directors of the East India Company, p. 17. 20. &c.

P. 76. [h] Besides the great college at Baghdad, called *Madrassat Al Nezamiat*, the College of *Nezam*, this vizir built others at Isphahan, Bassora and Herat. His master the Sultan Malekshah founded many in different parts of his dominions. [i] The Sultan Noureddin, who reigned in Syria in the time of the first Cruzades, founded one at Aleppo, and another at Damascus. The University which Saladin built at Cairo was so extensive, that a large volume is filled with the description of the particular colleges. Tamerlane established a noble seminary at Samarcand. Most of the great Eastern princes took a pride in those endowments: and they in general added to them Mosques, and Caravanseras for the accommodation of travellers.

P. 79. [1 k] Sclerus, a Greek general, who assumed the purple during the reign of the emperor Basilius II. in the tenth century, took refuge at Baghdad, where he had many private conferences with Azaddadowla king of Persia, and Emiru'l'Omra to the Khalif Al Tay. This

prince is alſo repreſented as converſing familiarly with the ambaſſadors of Nicephorus Phocas. And an Arabian merchant, whom he had ſent to Conſtantinople as a private agent, appears to have been ſo excellent a Grecian, that he forged in that tongue, and buried, to be dug up at a proper time, a prophecy of an alliance between the emperor of Greece and his maſter, as king of Perſia. A converſation is much celebrated, both by the Greek and Mohammedan writers, between Sultan Alp Arſlan (Emiru'l'Omra to the Khalif Al Kaiem) and the emperor Diogenes Romanus, whom he defeated and took priſoner in the eleventh century. The Mohammedan prince treated his royal captive with uncommon politeneſs, and ſet him at liberty on the promiſe of about 700,000 *l.* of ranſom, an annual tribute to the khalifat of 140,000 *l.* and his daughter in marriage to the Sultan's ſon. As the Vizir Nezām was preſent at this interview between Alp Arſlan and Romanus: the following account of it may be conſidered as more authentic than that of any hiſtorian, European or Aſiatic. "After ſome diſcourſe, the Sultan aſked "the Emperor of Greece, what he ſhould do with him." The Emperor replied, "If you are a Butcher, kill me; "if a Merchant, ſell me; and, if a Prince, ſet me at li- "berty." The Sultan had compaſſion on him, and treat- "ed him with great kindneſs. Some time after, the army "beginning to march back, the Emperor ſaid to the Sul- "tan, I am here a priſoner; and it is certain the empire "will not be long without a head; for doubtleſs ſome "other will uſurp the government, and you will then be "put to the trouble of marching back to reduce him. "Now that all the paſſes and ſtrong holds are as yet in "the poſſeſſion of my dependants; if you ſend me home, "I will be one of your tributaries. The Sultan then re-

"turned him in a royal manner; and he yearly paid the sti-"
"pulated tribute; and sent besides a quantity of the fine
"cloths of that country as a present." The misfortunes and death of Romanus, it must be observed, prevented his paying the whole of his ransom; but Alp Arslan having afterwards twice defeated the generals of Michael Ducas, who succeeded Romanus, the tribute agreed to by Romanus was continued to be paid by the Emperors of Greece for many years. —— Amongst other Greek and Roman authors, which were translated into Arabic, are Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Euclid, Apollonius, Archimedes, Hippocrates, Galen, Dioscorides, Ptolemy, Josephus, Pliny. They also translated many books from the Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Indian languages. See also Tarikhu'l'Mosslemin or Historia Saracenica, p. 277.—See likewise Newton's Chronology, p. 375. General History by Guthry and Gray, Vol. II. p. 195.

P. 82. [l] See Newton's Chronology, passim.

[a] See Mr. Bryant's Mythology, Vol. II. p. 97, &c. D'Herbelot, p. 455.—Errat. for Ctesias 2280 read 2075.

P. 85. [b] Dr. Rutherford's System of Natural Philosophy, Vol. II. p. 849. Newton's Chron. p. 84. &c.

P. 87. [c] See Mr. Bryant's Mythology, Vol. II. p. 478. Strabo builds for the Argonauts cities in Colchis, Iberia, Armenia, Media, along the coast of Sinope on the Euxine; in Crete; in Italy, on the Adriatic, in the Gulph of Poseidonium, and the Hetrurian isles; on the Propontis, the Hellespont, Lemnos, on the Ceraunian mountains of Epirus; besides other structures, of which he speaks with less confidence, on the Celtic coast, at Cadiz, and even as far as India.—Archbishop Usher, Bishop Cumberland,

Dr. Jackſon, among other moderns, have conſidered this expedition, as hiſtorical truth.

P. 88. [d] Kings c. xiv. 25, 26.—2 Chron. c. xii. 2, 3. Newton's Chron. p. 17. et ſeq. and p. 193, 217. &c. Bryant's Mythology, Vol. II. p. 86.

P. 92. [a] Iſaiah, ch. xliv. 28. Ch. xlv. 1. &c.—Nehemiah, ch. xii. 10, 11. Jeſhua, Joaikim, Eliaſhib, Joaida, Jonathan, Jaddua; who are expreſsly ſaid, in v. 22 to be the prieſts till the reign of *Darius the Perſian.*—Cyrus being never queſtioned, uncommon difficulties are found in making the eras coincide. *Darius the Perſian*, ſays Sir Iſaac, muſt be *Darius Nothus*; for *Darius Nothus* we ſhould read *Darius Hyſtaſpes*; *Artaxerxes Mnemon* ſhould be *Artaxerxes Longimanus*; and *Simeon Juſtus* ſhould be the high prieſt who met *Alexander*, and not *Jaddua*. See Newton's Chron. p. 358. et ſeq.—By this mode of alteration and ſubſtitution we may make any thing of any thing.

P. 93. [b] Eaſtern authors ſay, that *Ardeſhir*'s mother was of the tribe of Benjamin, and a deſcendant of Saul; alſo, that one of his favourite wives was of the tribe of Judah, and of the line of Solomon.

P. 100. [d] The firſt was the father of *Darius*, that is, *Achſuerus*, *Aſſuerus*, *Oxyares*, *Axeres*, or *Cyaxeres*, &c. *Newt. Chron.* p. 308.—*Xerxes*, *Achſchiroſch*, *Achſweros*, or *Oxyares*, ſucceeded his father *Darius*, &c. See p. 353.—Joſephus, the Septuagint, and Dr. Hyde, are apparently right with regard to the prince who married *Eſther*; yet notwithſtanding Dr. Hyde's opinion, (Relig. Vet. Perſ. p. 43.) it is not from the names that any analogy can be diſcovered. The king, in the Perſian hiſtorians, ſuppoſed, to correſpond with Artaxerxes Longimanus, is *Ardeſhir Dirazdeſt*, or *Bahaman*, ſo often mentioned; but except-

ing the initials, there is not a correſponding letter in the words; nor any circumſtance in ſound or ſenſe that can juſtify ſuch corruption. *Ardeſhir*, as before obſerved, (p. 98.) was a great friend to the Jews: his favourite wife, according to the Perſians, was of that nation; his era and marriage will agree therefore perfectly well with the Ahaſuerus of Scripture; who muſt, however, as well as the Jewiſh captivity, if this conjecture is found to be rational, be brought down about a century lower than the preſent chronology. —— In Nehemiah, Artaxerxes is written ארתחשסתא *Arteſeſta*: and Dr. Jackſon in his Chronology Vol. I. p. 454. ſuppoſes him to be Xerxes; which, as will be hereafter ſhewn, is impoſſible. Arteſeſta and Artaxerxes are apparently Hebrew and Greek corruptions of a Perſian royal title. And that there were two different princes ſo named in the Bible, will appear from Ezra and Nehemiah. The firſt was reigning in the year 522; and the other only began to reign in 466 before Chriſt. At the firſt of theſe periods the Greeks fill the Perſian throne with Cambyſes. See Ezra iv. 7. Nehemiah ii. 1.

Many words in Perſian are written either with or without the initial *Elif* or *A*; اسكندر *Eſkender* or سكندر *Sekender* Alexander. افريدون *Afridoun* or فريدون *Feridoun*. افشاندن *afſhanden* or فشاندن *fuſhanden* To ſcatter. اگر *eger* or گر *ger* If. ابر *aber* or بر *ber* Upon. اشكل *aſhkel* or شكل *ſhekel* A fetter, a ſhackle. اشكم *aſhkem* or شكم *ſhekem* The belly, &c. If *Choſru* is written with an initial *A*, it forms *Akhoſru*. In Hebrew *Ahaſuerus* is אחשורוש, which, by the difference of pointing (a mere arbitrary modern innovation, and not in uſe till many centuries after thoſe Sacred Books were written) may be

pronounced *Ahasuerus*, *Achasuerus*, *Achosurus*, *Achasurus*, &c. *as*, *es*, *os*, *us*, or *s*, being in general only Western terminations added to Eastern names; as *Darius* from *Dara*, *Sapores* from *Shapor*, *Hormisdas* from *Hormozd*. The difference therefore between *Chosru* and *Ahasuerus* appears so simple, and so much in conformity with the idiom of the language, that it may rather be called a provincial variation than a corruption; there being many words in Scripture, which undeniably mean the same place, written with a much greater disagreement: the sacred writers, in matters of such trifling import as proper names, appearing always to have followed the general rule, of spelling such words after the manner in which the Jews then pronounced them.—The following is given as one example of the different manner of naming the same place: *Ararat*, the mountain where the ark rested after the flood, is called, by Jeremiah, *Ararat Minni*; the Syriac and the Chaldee paraphrast make it *Kardu*; the Samarito-Chaldaic version, *Tararah Sarnedib*; the Hebrew-Samaritan, *Hararat*; the Arabic, *Karda*; and the Vulgate, *Montes Armeniæ*. See *Ezra*, Chap. iv. 5. 6.

P. 102. 'Many circumstances in our own times, it may be here observed, create no wonder, because they are familiar; but a little attention to them will often save us much trouble. How many different shapes does the same Christian name assume in the different nations of Europe? and if we allow such liberties to the ancients, which unquestionably they took, we shall be no more surprised at finding the same word differently pronounced by a *Hebrew*, a *Persian*, a *Syrian*, or a *Greek*; than by an *Englishman*, a *Frenchman*, a *Spaniard*, or an *Italian*. Could any thing but positive information induce an Asiatic to believe

that the following were the same names: *John*, *Joannes*, *Jean*, *Juan* (pronounced also *Huan*), *Ivan*, and *Giovanni*— *James*, *Jacobus*, *Jaques*, *Jago*, and *Giacomo*—*Joseph* and *Giuseppé*—*George* and *Jorje* (pronounced also *Horhe*)— *William*, *Guillielmus*, *Guillaume*, and *Guillermo* — *Walter*, *Gualterus*, *Gautier*, &c.

See this Dissertation, p. 19. 29. and their notes.

There are many names in Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah, which are undoubtedly Persian; and others which are probably so, though under Chaldaic and Hebrew disguise; as *Esther* from استر *ester* or ستارا *sitara* A star; مهمان *mehman* A stranger or guest; ميشاخ *mishakh* A vine branch; ملزار *melzar* A vineyard. وشتي *vashti* A beautiful or excellent woman. — גנזי *ginzi* or *ganzi* (*Esth.* c. iii. 9.) seems to be the Persian كنجي *gunji* or *ginji* A treasury; and here the learned Bochart (Phaleg p. 69.) seems to have made a mistake: for he says "Persæ hodie "dicunt כניז *ceniz*;"; كنز *kenz* in Arabic signifies Treasure; but كنيز *keniz* or *ceniz*, in Persian, signifies A girl; and the word in that language denoting A treasury, as above observed, is exactly the same with that in the Bible: the difference of vowels being of no consequence; and nothing being more common in the East, even at this hour, than pronouncing many words written with ج *j*, as if spelt with z; as فوجدار *foujdar* or *fouzdar*; گجرات *Gujerat* or *Guzerat*; جنگيز خان *Jengiz Khan* or *Zengiz Khan*.—Indeed almost every observation which this learned man has made, with regard to the Persian, evidently shews that he did not understand it; and there are many circumstances which render his knowledge of the Arabic questionable. Had he understood it, he could not easily have made the above observation on *ceniz*; any more than

the following: "Nehemiæ ii. 8. פרדס (pardus) *paradiſus* creditur eſſe Perſicum." فردوس *fardus* is however an Arabic word, as well as Hebrew: but it is foreign to the Perſian.—N. B. The Arabians having no پ *p*, uſe ب *b* or ف *f* inſtead of it. — Bochart's conjectures, with regard to *Paſergada*, (which, without neceſſity, he tranſpoſes to *Paraſgada*, and tranſlates Perſian army) *Chorſakas*, *Shatranj*, &c. p. 69 and 253 are alſo wrong.

P. 104. [1] See this Diſſertation, p. 18. et ſeq.

105. [a] See New Syſtem of Ancient Mythology, by Mr. Bryant, Vol. I. p. 226. "I am entirely a ſtranger to the "Perſic and Arabic languages." See Vol. III. p. 34. "In our progreſs to obtain this knowledge, we muſt have "recourſe to the writers of Greece. *It is in vain to talk* "*about the Arabian or Perſic literature of modern date*;" *&c.*

[b] See Preface to Vol. I.

P. 108. [c] Mr. Bryant ſays, Vol. III. p. 582. "It is "ſaid, that in the Shaſter of this people (Gentoos) a like "hiſtory is given of the earth being overwhelmed by a de-"luge, in which mankind periſhed." How ſhall we reconcile this with the following extract from the Preface to the Code of Gentoo laws, (p. xxxix.) "For then we at "once come to the immediate era of the Flood, which "calamity is never once mentioned in thoſe Shaſters; "and which yet we muſt think infinitely too remarkable "to have been even but ſlightly ſpoken of, much leſs to "have been totally omitted, had it even been known in "that part of the world. The Bramins indeed remove "this objection by two aſſertions: one, that all their "Scriptures were written before the time by us allotted "to Noah; the other, that the Deluge really never took "place in Hindoſtan." — See alſo Obſervations on the

Apamean Medal, by the Hon. Daines Barrington, in the Archæologia of the Society of Antiquaries, Vol. IV. p. 315.

P. 110. [d] Bryant's Mythol. Vol. I. Pref. p. vii. and xv.

P. 111, 112. [e f] The principal of these are, *Aur*, *our*, *or*; *el*; *on*, *aon*, or *eon*; *cham*, *ham*, or *hama*; *ait* or *aith*; *as*, *ees* or *is*; *ſan*, *ſon*, *zan* or *zaan*; *ſemon*; *arez*; *kur* or *cur*; *bel*, *bal* or *baal*; *aſt*, *aſta*, *eſta* or *heſtia*; *ſhem*, *ſhamen* or *ſhemeſh*; *ſer*; *tal*, &c. Bryant's Mythology, Vol. I. from p. 1. to 127. Vol. II. 190. and 535. Vol. III. Pref. p. vii. et paſſim. See alſo Dict. رجوم *rujum*.

P. 115. [g] العين *elain*, الاور *elaur*, عين الشام *ain el ſham*, السايد and السعيد *el ſaid* or *eſſaid*. See alſo Mythology, Vol. I. p. 15. and 16. Likewiſe Arab. Gramm. p. 10. See Moallakat Amralkeiſi, diſt. 27.

فقالت يمين الله ما لك حيلة

Fakalat yaminallahi ma lika hilatoun,

And ſhe ſaid, By the right hand of God, you ſhall not be deceived.

El implies likewiſe, *A race*, *family*, &c. in which ſenſe, as a prefix or an adjunct to the name of the founder, it may denote any people deſcended from one common anceſtor; but without marking any particular mode of worſhip: and we find it accordingly uſed often by hiſtorians, to diſtinguiſh the families of Eaſtern princes; as *Al Othman* The houſe of Othman, *Al Seljuk* The Suljukian dynaſty, *Al Jengiz* The family of Jengiz. —See Dictionary آل —as the Perſians generally add, in pronunciation, a ſhort *i* to the noun which governs the genitive, they may be alſo written in our characters, *Ali Oſman*, &c. N. B. *Othman* is the Arabian, and *Oſman* the Perſian pronunciation of عثمان See alſo Dict. الله

P. 116. [h] *Aon*, in Arabick, it may be obſerved, ſignifies *aſſiſtance*, *defender*, &c. *Elaon* might denote, therefore, The *defender*; *Ab-el-aon*, The *Father Defender*; which, whatever may have been the true origin, ſeems a more ſimple and unforced etymology, at leaſt, than the interpretations of *Summus Sol*, and *Pater Deus Sol*, for which no ſolid bottom can apparently be diſcovered. See Dict. عون See Woodward on the Wiſdom of the Egyptians, in the Archeologia of the Society of Antiquaries, Vol. IV. p. 212.

P. 119. [i] *Hamé*, Mr. Bryant ſays, Vol. I. p. 3. on the information of *Gale*'s *Court of the Gentiles*, ſignifies the Sun in Perſic. The authority is ſuſpicious: I have been able to diſcover nothing ſimilar to it in that language; and muſt with-hold my belief. هام *Ham* or هامه *hamé*, ſignifies in Arabic, *inter alia*, A *prince* or *chief of a family*; and in that ſenſe may explain the origin of many names: whilſt حمه *hammé*, implying A *warm bath* or *ſpring*, might naturally give appellations to hot bituminous fountains, without forcing their etymological origin to the Sun, or to the patriarch *Ham*.

A tranſpoſition of radicals is to be found, though it occurs but ſeldom; as مدلوج or دملوج Bracelets; مغروسة or مزغوسة Confuſion, &c.

P. 120. [k] Mythology, Vol. I. p. 18. See alſo Dictionary اية Hebrew איח *ait*; اذر *azer*, and ماه *mah* p. 1570. — The Arabians, &c. pronounce ذ *dh*, *ds*, or *th*; ض and ظ *dh*, *dd*, *dz*, *ds*, *dth*, all which the Perſians ſound *z*. See alſo Arabic Gram. p. 9.

P. 121. [l] Mythology, Vol. I. p. 26. See alſo Dict. اس *as*, اساس *aſas*, and اسيس *aſis* — عز *az*, عزاز *azaz*, and عزيز *aziz*. See likewiſe اتش *atiſh*, and اد اس *ad-as*.

P. 123. [m] Mythology, Vol. I. p. 34. Vol. II. p. 122-3. &c. زون *zun* in Arabic, it may not be improper to obſerve, ſignifies an *idol* in general.—See alſo Dictionary اذر *azer*, اذرسان *azerſan* or ادرسان *aderſan* and برذين *berzin*.

P. 126. [n] Mythology, Vol. I. p. 62. and 225. and 226. Vol. II. p. 461. *Heſtia* muſt be from a different root: In Perſian هستي *heſti* ſignifies *A being*, *ſubſtance*, *exiſtence*, *eſſence*; and in this ſenſe may have perhaps been uſed as the name, title, or attribute of a divinity. Iſtakhar ought properly to be ſpelt استخر, but by the Arabians it is in general written اصطخر; whence Dr. Hyde has conceived the derivation to have been from صخر rocks. See Dict. ايستا, استا, استادن, ايستادن, خر and خور

It may be obſerved, as a general rule, that the Perſians, Arabians, and Indians, writing without the ſhort vowels, and ſeldom in their manuſcripts affixing the vowel points, it is impoſſible to reduce them to any fixed ſtandard: the pronunciation of different kingdoms or diſtricts being, in many reſpects, diſtinct from one another. Where a word is ſpelt therefore in our characters *aſta*, *eſta*, *iſta*, *oſta*, or *uſta*, it makes, in general, no alteration in the ſenſe. Eaſtern nations have indeed not only a variation in pronouncing; but much of the apparent diſcrepance has ariſen from the different powers, which the different nations and individuals of Europe have given to thoſe vowels; and the arbitrary modes which tranſlators and travellers have laid down for expreſſing Oriental words in the characters of Europe: there being hardly, for example, two gentlemen from India, who, although ſounding the words preciſely in the ſame manner, will not, when expreſſing thoſe ſounds upon paper, differ remarkably in the compaſs of a

very few lines.—See Arabic Grammar, p. 5. and Preface to Specimen of Persian Poetry, p. xiii.

It may be objected to those etymologies, perhaps, that the word is most commonly written اصطخر: but, whilst the authority of the author of the *Farhang Jehangiri*, who spells it in the true Persian manner استخر, appears to be unquestionable on this ground; when we consider, at the same time, that the character now in use amongst those Oriental nations, had no existence (as observed above, p. 10.) till the tenth century of our era; and that *Istachar* was founded perhaps 2000 years before that period; those particular letters, which the Arabians have since chosen to express that name, can have no more weight in a discussion of this nature, than advancing the French manner of writing *Londres*, as an argument that *London* was an error.— See also Mythology, Vol. I. p. 65 and 66.

P. 130. ° Hebrew שמש *shemesh*. Arabic شمس *shems* The Sun. شام *sham* Syria; with the article, الشام or الشامه *elsham* or *eshshameh*.

D'Herbelot says, p. 772. that some Eastern geographers derive the name *Sham* from a *wart*; because the country is studded over with a number of small hillocks, resembling those excrescences on the face. Black moles on the face have ever been considered in the East as extremely beautiful; and circumstances full as whimsical have often given names to places.—See also Dictionary سوري

See Mythology, Vol. I. p. 6. and 94.—The Oriental adjunct is ستان *stan* or ايستان *istan*, the participle of استادن, ايستادن, استاندن or ايستاندن To stand, reside, dwell, place, fix, &c. whence مغل ايستان or مغلستان *Mogul-istan* (part of Tartary). هندوستان or هندستان

Hindo-ſtan (India). فارسيستان *Fars-iſtan* (Perſia). خوزستان *Chuz-iſtan* (Suſiana). This laſt country Mr. Bryant, as well as Bochart, ſuppoſes to have been ſo named from *Chus*; but *z* and *s*, as before obſerved, being diſtinct radicals, and never confounded but by error or vulgariſm, it has a very ſuſpicious bottom: whilſt خوز *Chuz* in Perſian ſignifies *a nation*; and is particularly applied to denote the inhabitants of this very diſtrict.

P. 130. P 9 r *Aur* (Vol. I. p. 13.) ſeems to be the Arabic ار *ar*, *irr*; اري *ari*, *ira*; اوار *uwar* (plur. اور *awr* or *awar*) Heb. אור *aur*, which denote, amongſt other ſignifications, Fire, a fire-place, kindling a fire, heat (of the Sun, of fire, of thirſt, &c.) — *Ab* (Myth. Vol. I. p. 2.) is אב in Heb. and اب in Arab. *Father*. — *Ad* (p. 23.) Mr. Bryant conceives to be A *chief*, *king*, *lord*; and ſuppoſes, when doubled, that *adad* ſhould imply ſomething ſuperlative, as *A king of kings*; but ſuperlatives are not ſo formed in the Eaſtern dialects; and اد *ad* is perfectly ſynonymous with اداد *adad*; both, in Arabic, implying *Victory*, *ſtrength*, *ſuperior power*, &c. neither is *ada* the feminine of *ad*, ادا or ادي being a different root, ſignifying *aſſiſting*; alſo, *increaſing in ſtrength*, &c. None of thoſe words, at the ſame time, appear to ſignify *one*, according to Macrobius; nor *firſt*, agreeable to Mr. Bryant's conjecture. عد *Ad* and عداد *adad*, from another root, denote *Number* in general; and عدو *adu* (pl. اعدا *ada*) ſignifies *an enemy*: in all which ſenſes we can ſee ſufficient preſumption for the formation of proper names: and for their being figuratively applied to chiefs or conquerors, to friends as well as foes. —Our learned author next objects (p. 25.) to the de-

rivation of *Adam*, *adama*, *adamana*, and other ſimilar names, &c. from the Hebrew אדם, or the Arabic ادم, wiſhing to ſupport the Cuthites, by tracing ſuch places to *Adham*, which he tranſlates *Lord Ham:* but, whilſt *Ad* does not appear to ſignify a *Lord*; whilſt the veneration paid to *Ham* is by no means proved; and whilſt the texture of the Oriental languages, as above obſerved (p. 118.) will not allow the dropping of the medial *h*, we can ſee no ground for departing from the above roots; which not only denote the *Father of mankind*, but *man in general*, *a chief*, *concord*, *ſociety*, &c. which are, unqueſtionably, etymological grounds of ſuperior ſtrength to that which he propoſes.—*Semon*, he ſays, (p. 38.) ſignifies *Cœleſtis Sol*; but it appears to be ſimply the Arabic سما *ſema*, or the Perſian سمان *ſeman* or اسمان *aſuman* Heaven, without any particular reference to the Sun. *Di* or *Dio* a deity (p. 38.) appears to have ſome analogy to the Perſian ديو pronounced *dio*, *diu*, *dew*, or *div*, which implies *a ſupernatural being*, *a demon*, *a genie*, &c.—*Kur* (p. 39.) appears to be the Perſian خر or خور *Khur* The Sun.—*Cohen* or *Kahen*, he ſays, (p. 40.) appear to have been pronounced *Cahen* and *Chan*, and to have ſignified a *Prieſt*, and alſo a *Lord* or *Prince.*—كهن *kuhun* in Perſian and كاهن *kahen* Arab. (pl. كهنة *kehené* or *kehenet* and كهان *kehan*) ſignify *a prieſt*, *ſoothſayer*, *augur*, &c. But the word which denotes a prince is from a different root, being written خان *Khan*, the name by which the emperors of Tartary and other Eaſtern princes have been generally known. As for *Konah*, the title of Moſes, it differs from both, being the Hebrew קנה.—*Bel*, *Bal*, *Baal* (p. 45.); بعل in Ara-

bic signifies *a lord*, *a master*, &c. which appears to be the true meaning of this Babylonish idol's name; and no proof is brought of its being in any shape the particular representative of the Sun.—*Keren* or *kern* (p. 46.) signifies, in Arabic, *a horn*; قرن *keren* denotes also *junction* in general, and قران *keran* A *happy conjunction of the planets*: it is also an epithet synonymous to *Felix* or *Augustus*: hence صاحب قران *saheb keran* has been a royal title adopted by many Oriental princes, especially by *Tamerlane* and by *Shah Jehan* the Great Mogul, (See Dictionary p. 1033.)—ذو القرنين *Zulkernin* was also a title given to the two Alexanders, or *Caicobad* and *Alexander the Great*, (See Dict. سكندر). *Craneus* or *Carneus*, which Mr. Bryant mentions as titles of the Sun, may possibly be merely the Greek termination added to كران *keran* or *geran*, كرانه *kerané* or *gerané*, which, in Persian, mean *great*, *grand*, *exalted*, *excellent*; epithets naturally applicable by the Persians to that splendid body which was so long the chief ostensible object of their worship.—*Oph* A serpent, (p. 49.) may perhaps be analogous to the Arabic افعي *efa* or *efai* A viper; whilst اوب *aub* signifies in Persian A *large serpent* or the *Python*; and *Abadir*, which he interprets the *serpent deity*, may possibly be the Persian اوب ادر *aubadir* signifying a *fiery serpent*.—*Ain* A fountain, (p. 51.) is the Arabic عين— Under this article, a note occurs (p. 56.) relative to *Damascus*, which is a further proof how much a resemblance of sounds may mislead where there is no radical knowledge. He says, *Damasec* is the city of the prince; but whilst it is impossible to make a city of *Dam* or *Ad-kam*, شيخ *Sheikh* A prince, &c. is a root widely differing from the

terminating ſyllable of دمشق *Demſhek*, the common way of writing Damaſcus (See Dict.) — *Phi* or *fi* (p. 89.) في *Phi* in Arabic ſignifies the *mouth*: it is the genitive of فو *fu* or فوه *Phuh*; but it is alſo uſed in the nominative: whence في عين *Phi-aini* or *Phi-ainin* may imply, The *mouth of a fountain.* I ſhould much doubt, however, if *Pharaoh* can have any relation to this particle. فرعون *Phiraon* in Arabic ſignifies A *crocodile*; and the people of Egypt are called by them فرعون قومي *Phiraon Koumi* The people of the crocodile. It ſignifies alſo, metaphorically, a tyrant; but whether this meaning took its origin from the voraciouſneſs of the animal, or the animal was ſo named from the brutality of the prince, it may be difficult to determine. Some learned men, it may be obſerved, however, have doubted whether this word was ever adopted by the Egyptian kings, or applied by their ſubjects; conſidering it merely as a name of contempt, beſtowed upon them by neighbouring nations. *Phialé* ſeems to be the Perſian پياله *pialé*, (it being common with the Arabians and other nations to change the Perſian *p* into *ph*, as فارس for پارس Perſia; فيل for پيل An elephant, &c. *Pialé* ſignifies a phial, a cup, and alſo a large veſſel; and hence may imply any ſubterraneous baſon into which a river might diſcharge itſelf.—*Ai*, and *aia* (p. 90.) may perhaps be the Arabic اي *aya* اوي *awa*, which denotes a *manſion*, *dwelling*, *place of reſt*, *ſettlement or reſidence*; and, in that ſenſe, may apply to the combination of *Aigupt*, the dwelling of the Copts or Egyptians. With regard to *Athenai*, *Thebai*, &c. I ſhould hardly ſuppoſe, that theſe had any connection with the Eaſt; being mere Greek in-

flexions. In which light I ſhould likewiſe view *Rom-a*; *Etn-a* (which he interprets the *country of Rom*, *of Etn*, &c) ; as I think it rather refining too much upon derivation to ſearch for occult Aſiatic meanings for mere Grecian and Roman terminations ; which are ſo perfectly conſonant to the texture of the Greek and Latin tongues. As to *India*, which upon this etymology he would tranſlate The *Country of Ind*, it certainly was never known in that quarter of the world; the original word being هند *hind* An Indian, or the Indian nation; هندي *hindi*, or هندو *hindou* Indian, belonging to India, &c. هندوستان or هندستان The country of the Indians.—*Macar*, which (p. 67.) he ſays is a ſacred Amonian title, and gives names in conſequence to many places, appears to be ſimply the Arabic مقر *Macarr*, which denotes a *place* of *reſidence*, a *habitation*, &c. *Macarron* is the ſame word, either in the plural, or pronounced with the *nunnation*. (In reading the Alcoran and other books in the ſolemn ſtyle, *on* is often the termination of the nominative caſe, *in* of the genitive or dative, and *an* of the accuſative; which, in common reading or converſation, is generally dropt: this is what Arabic grammarians call *nunnation*, See Arab. Gramm. p. 33, &c.) The ancient Gedroſia is now named Mocran. —*Melech*, (p. 70.) is Hebrew and Arabic for a *king*, and alſo an *angel*; as מלך and ملك *melek* or مالك *malek*; and ملكة *meleké* or *meleket* A *queen*.—*Anak* (p. 72.) ſeems to be analogous to the Arabic عنق or اعنق *anak* or *unk*, which denote *Princes*, *chiefs*, *tall men*, &c.—*Sar* or *zar* (p. 73.) سر *ſer* or *ſar*, in Perſian, ſignifies The *head*, *ſummit*, *chief*, *principal*, &c. and is one of the moſt com-

mon compounds in the language; as, سردار *fardar* A *general*, or *chief*; سرخيل *ferkheil* The *commander of a troop*; سراخور *ferakhur* The *mafter of the horfe*, &c. Placed after nouns, سار *far* denotes *Magnitude*, *multitude*, and *fimilitude*; as كوهسار *kuhfar* A *large mountain or mountainous country*; برگسار *berkfar Full of leaves*; شاه سار *fhahfar Royal, like a king*. سارا *fara* means *pure*, *excellent*, &c. سرا *fera* is A *palace*; زار *zar* is an adjunct expreffive of *place*, efpecially where there is a great quantity of any thing, as لاله زار *laleh zar* A *bed of tulips*; گلزار *gulzar* A *rofe-garden*. زر *zer* fignifies *gold*; زرسان *zerfan* Golden. A variety of other meanings may be given of thofe words; which, in their natural, unforced fenfes, will denote *Dignity*, *quality*, or *fituation*, without having recourfe to the figurative fignification of a *rock*, which is doubtful and unconvincing. It may alfo be obferved in general, that all Perfian nouns, (with very few exceptions) when applied to any thing having life, form their plurals in *an*; fo that combinations of titles, fuch as *far-an*, *far-on*, &c. are eafily deducible from the fame roots, without any compound, or adjunct.—*Air* (p. 92.) اير *air*, in Arabic, denotes the *North* and the *Eaft*; alfo a *fcorching wind*; it fignifies likewife a *hard ftone*, *cotton*, &c. From another root, عير *air* means a *caravan*, a *chief*, a *prince*, &c. ارا *Ara* implies *honey*, *fweet dew*, *manna*, (and, as well as *ar*, *ir*, *or*) *fire*, *heat*, &c. *Ara* in Perfian expreffes *Adorning*, *beautifying*, *ornament*, &c. all which fenfes may eafily be fuppofed to have entered into the compofition of many names of places; as the accident of fituation, elegance of buildings, the produce of the foil, or a refpect for their chiefs, might fuggeft.

The ſame idea may be likewiſe adopted with regard to قير *kir*, قار *kar*, قور *kur*, &c. which in Arabic ſignify *Bitumen*, *pitch*, *camels*, &c. *Kar*, *kur*, *Karat*, *kirat*, &c. A *hill*, a *large ſtone*, a *tract of ſtony country*, *cotton*, &c. كار *Kar* in Perſian denotes *Art*, *commerce*, &c. whence we may eaſily ſuppoſe, *The country of bitumen*, *cotton*, or *camels*, *The caſtle on the hill*, *The city of commerce*, *The rocky region*, &c, &c.—*Col*, *cal*, *calah*, &c. (p. 93.) may be different modes of pronouncing the Arabic قلع قلعة *kala* or *kalat* (plur. قلاع *kyla*) which imply *Caſtles*, *towers*, &c. eſpecially on the tops of mountains or high grounds.—قلة (plur. قلل) Arab. is A *hill*.— جب *Gib* (p. 94.) in Arabic denotes a mountainous country, which is alſo expreſſed by جبل *Gibl*; whence comes *Gibraltar*.—تار *Tar*, in Perſian, is the ſummit or ridge of a mountain, &c. and طور *Tur*, in Arabic, is generally uſed to expreſs *Mount Sinai*.—*Caph*, &c. (p. 95.) which is interpreted *A rock*, *promontory*, &c. has every appearance of being that fabulous mountain قاف *Kaf*, (ſee Dictionary) which the Arabians, Perſians, and other eaſtern nations have ſuppoſed, beyond all tradition and long after Mohammed, to ſurround the world. It became therefore the ſubject of much fable, and of perpetual alluſion; every hill or promontory, which their writers meant to diſtinguiſh, (like Alps or Alpine with us) being called *Kaf* or *Kaph*. *Caph-el*, *Caph-ar*, and *Caph-arez*, may therefore be interpreted The *Mount of God*, the *Vulcano* or *mountain of fire*; the *Hill of the world*, &c. ارض *arez*, amongſt many ſignifications, denoting *the world*; without having ſeemingly any reference to the *Sun*; which, in a variety of places, Mr. Bryant lays down as an undiſ-

puted fact, but without supporting it by the least satisfactory authority. — *Beth* is the Hebrew בית, the Arabic being بيت *beit*: they both signify a *house*, *temple*, &c. اباد *Abad* is Persian, and implies a *place of residence*. گو or گاو *Gau* or *kaw* (p. 98.) in Persian, means a *hollow*, *low ground*, *or any excavation*; whence it might be applied to a *house in a bottom*, *a cavern*, or any thing similar; it also denotes *magnificent*, *venerable*, *great*, *strong*, *warlike*, *powerful*. *Gaw* signifies likewise The *Sun*, with a variety of other meanings, see Dictionary.—*Thaman*, which (Vol. III. p. 10.) he says, signified *eight*, in the ancient language of the country round Mount *Ararat*, where the ark is supposed to have rested, is merely the Arabic ثمان *thaman*; and *ceman* or *seman* seems to be only that variation of sound, given by the Persians and other nations to the initial Arabic ث *t'h*, which they cannot pronounce: this renders it quite unnecessary, therefore, to alter *Cemainum* or *Shemainum*, as he proposes in the following page.—There appears in many countries an antipathy to *t'h* or *th*. As I have observed before (p. 13.) most nations in Europe avoid the sound. Even the English, with whom it may be called a kind of *Shiboleth*, have in later times almost universally received *has*, *loves*, and other third persons, in place of *hath* and *loveth*: whilst many speakers pronounce *authority*, and similar words, *autority*, &c.—There seems to be a mistaken conjecture (p. 12.) relative to the city of *Tabriz* or *Tauris* (the capital of the country called *Adherbijan* or *Azerbijan*, part of the *Armenia* and *Media* of the Greeks), which, he says, is named likewise *Albors* or *Albaris*. This he imagines to be a contraction of *Tabaris* or *Tavaris*; but the first is apparently Arabic, the other Persian: برس

and برص *bors* in Arabic have a great variety of meanings; the laſt, *inter alia*, ſignifying *leprous*; and, with the Arabic article prefixed, البرص implies *The moon*, from the ſpotted appearance of her diſk. تبريز or تابريز *Tabriz* is the name by which this place is generally known; and is conjectured to have been given on account of that healthineſs of ſituation, for which it has been much remarked; the firſt word implying *diſperſing a fever*, or *reſiſting an infection*: tho' it is not impoſſible, as this country was anciently famous for the adoration of fire, that the name ſhould have an alluſion to that circumſtance; for تابريز may be interpreted *Scattering heat*, *diffuſing ſplendor*, &c. البرس كوه *albors kuh* (The mountain *Albors*) is celebrated by Firdouſi: and it is mentioned, by Ali Yezdi, l. 3. c. 57. of his life of Tamerlane; but that is apparently further to the northward, and not the place here referred to.

The difficulty, if unacquainted with the languages, of diſcovering the analogy of Eaſtern words by the eye or the ear, will evidently appear from a few examples. ارز (*Arz*, *arez*, &c.) in Arabic, ſignifies *A pine*, or any *cone-bearing tree*; *a chief*; *robuſt*; *cold*; &c: (in Perſian) *Price*, *value*, *quantity eſteem*, *honour*. ارض (*arz*, *arez*, or *aredh* Arab.) ſignifies the *Earth*; عرض (*arz*, &c.) A *preſent*; *an accident*; *deſire*; *plunder*; *an army*; *merchandize*, &c. —عرس (*aris*) *Aſtoniſhed*; *a ſpouſe*; *wedlock*.— عرص (*aris*) *Cheerful*. — ارش (*ariſh*) A *quarrel*, *a mulct for manſlaughter*. عرش (*ariſh*) A *throne*.—بتل (*betel*) *Cutting*, *ſeparating*.—بطل (*betel*) A *champion*; *heroic*; with numbers

of others which might be easily adduced.—Whilst مصطفي (*Mustafa*) *Excellent*, *selected*, is derived from the root صفي (*sefi*) of the same signification.)—محمد (*Mohammed*) *Deserving great praise*; احمد (*Ahmed*) *More praise-worthy*. ممدح (*Mumeddeh*) or ممدوح (*Memduh*) *Praised*, *celebrated*; and ممدوحات (*Memduhat*) *Celebrated things*, are all brought from حمد *hemd Praise*.—انصار (*ansar*) *Defenders* (i. e. The citizens of Medina, who supported Mahomet). المنصور (*Almansor*) *Assisted*, *defended*, *celebrated for victories*, *august*. مستنصر (*Mostanser*) *Imploring or receiving assistance* (names of two Khalifs) come from the radical نصر (*nesr*) *Victory*, *defence*, *assistance*.

Since writing the above, I have seen a Review of Mr. Bryant's Mythology, printed at Amsterdam: in which the authors appear to have expressed themselves with an indecent petulance, which, for the honour of learning, it were to be wished might never accompany a difference of opinion. If they turn to his Preface, to the first volume of the Mythology, p. xiv. they will read "The mistakes of the Greeks in respect to ancient "terms, which they strangely perverted, will be exhibited in many instances: and much true history will be "ascertained from a detection of this peculiar misapplication." Many other passages clearly explain his plan: and one of his chief objects is thence to develope ancient mythology from the obscurity in which the Greeks had involved it, by corrupting the channels of derivation. He endeavours to penetrate therefore to the fountain head of language, of which he considers the Greek to be only a remote stream. His ideas, on this ground, are judicious;

and he wanted only a knowledge of Eaſtern learning, to have made many curious and intereſting diſcoveries. With what propriety then can thoſe gentlemen triumph, and queſtion Mr. Bryant's knowledge of the Greek, when he profeſſedly goes to a higher origin for his Etymologies? Where is the juſtice of the following among many ſimilar criticiſms, "Αφητωρ Apollo falſo ſit ex *Apha*, ignis, "et *tor* turris; cum ſecundum certiſſimas linguæ rationes ab αφιημι oriatur? Where is the decency of "Cum "ubique in Bryantio temeritatis novitatem miraremur, "excogitare tamen non potuimus quis eum ſtupor tenue-"rit, cum hæc ſcriberet?" (p. 68.)

P. 138. [b] See I. Diſſertation prefixed to Hiſtory of Engliſh Poetry, by the Rev. Mr. Warton.—See alſo The Hiſtory of the Decline of the Roman Empire, by Edw. Gibbon, Eſq. p. 246.—Abbé Raynal, Hiſtoire Philoſophique et Politique, Tom. II. p. 142.—Gov. Pownal Archeologia of Society of Antiquaries, Vol. II. p. 264.—Wiſe on the firſt Inhabitants, Language, &c. of Europe, p. 84.

P. 141. [c] Olaus Wormius Liter. Runic, cap. 20. Bartholin Antiq. Daniæ, lib. ii. cap. 8. lib. iii. cap. 2. Lazius de Gent. migrat. l. x. fol. 573. and 1600.—Olaus Rudbeck, cap. v. ſect. 2. Arngrim. Crymogæa, Jon. lib. i. cap. 4. Mallet Introduction à l'Hiſtoire de Dannemarc, tom. ii. p. 9, &c. The Venerable Bede. And Johann. Ihre, Gloſſarium Suiogothicum, voce Oden, &c.

See Pref. to Alfred's Saxon Oroſius.

P. 143. [d] Mallet. Hiſt. Dannem. c. ii.—Preface to Alfred's Saxon Oroſius, by Spelman. Vit. Alfredi Spelm. Append. vi.

P. 147. [e f] Among the *Tartar*, or more properly *Tatar*

nations, who, with ſome ſimilar features, have, at the ſame time, in many points, a diverſity of character, are the *Moguls*, *Calmaks* or *Aluths*, the *Atracks* or *Turks*, the *Turkmans*, the *Uſbecs*, the *Canghelis* or *Kanklis*, *Cazelaks*, *Tamgages*, *Kipchaks*, *Crims*, *Sartes*, the inhabitants of *Bokhara*, *Khata* or *Khoten*, *Toncat* or *Tangut*, and *Thibet*, the *Telanguts*, *Tumats*, *Virats*, *Cataguns*, *&c.*

P. 148. [g] Les Arabes et les Tartares ſont des peuples paſteurs. Les Arabes ſe trouvent dans les cas generaux dont nous avons parlé, et ſont libres; au lieu que les Tartares (peuple le plus ſingulier de la terre) ſe trouvent dans l'eſclavage politique. — Ils n'ont point de villes, ils n'ont point de forêts, ils ont peu de marais, leurs rivieres ſont preſque toujours glacées, ils habitent une immenſe plaine, &c. L'Eſprit des loix, Liv. xviii. ch. 19.

P. 150. [a] See Sir W. Blackſtone's Commentaries, Book ii. ch. iv. L'Eſprit des Loix, lib. xxx. ch. i. Dr. Robertſon's Charles V. vol. i. p. 15. 255. et ſeq. Millar on the Diſtinction of Ranks in Society, ch. iv. Voltaire Eſſai ſur l'Hiſtoire Generale, ch. xxiii. Sir John Dalrymple's Feudal Syſtem. Spelman on Feuds. Wright on Tenures. Gravina Orig. lib. i. §. 139. Crag. Du Cange, voce Feudum, &c.

P. 152. [b c] A *fief* in Perſian is called بلوك *Beluk*, being deſcribed as a tract of country which a ſubject obtains by gift from the prince, by purchaſe, or by ſucceſſion; and holds for military ſervice. سيورغال *Siyurghal*, ſignifies alſo a *feudal tenure.* A *feudatory chief* or *military tenant* is called سپاهي — In Arabic اخذة *akhezet* and قطيعة *ketiat* are generally underſtood as *fiefs:* the firſt implying The receiving of lands from a chief; and the other expreſſing

The cutting off a certain diſtrict from a greater, and giving it to a ſubject on certain conditions. As theſe words may however refer alſo to *copyholds* or *farms*, nothing concluſive can be drawn from them alone. زعامة *Ziyamet* in Arabic denotes alſo A *fief* beſtowed for *military ſervices*; and زعيم *zaym* from the ſame root A *feudal chief*, or *military tenant*. نفير عام *nefiri amm* implies A general ſummons of nobles to take the field with their military vaſſals.—لقاح *lekah* A maſculine or noble tribe; one that was never conquered, nor acknowledged a feudal dependence on kings. — زمين بوس *zemin bous* (Kiſſing the earth) was a kind of homage which the old kings of Perſia impoſed upon their feudatory princes. They called it likewiſe روي زمين *rui zemin* (Face on the ground). They had alſo the ceremony of پابوس *pabous* (kiſſing the feet); which word the Spaniards have adopted, when they write to men of the firſt quality. The Khalifs, along with the القاب *alcab* or titles, uſed generally to ſend to their feudatory princes a Banner, which, whilſt they preſerved their allegiance, was always carried before them. It was thus that the Khalif Wathek inveſted Thaher ben Abdallah, about the year 873, in the principality of Khoraſſan. Amongſt other marks of homage among the Mohammedan princes, the name of the paramount ſovereign was always mentioned firſt in public prayers: vaſſals had not the سراپرده *ſeraperdé* or fourth curtain at the door of the hall of audience; and the trumpet was not ſounded when they went out, or returned to the palace. See Dictionary under the words mentioned above: alſo D'Herbelot 508. 756. 927. 1018.

P. 156. [d] See Dictionary گاو *Gao*, فريدون *Feridun*, رستم *Rostam*, افراسياب *Afrasiab*, اسفنديار *Asfendiar*, سكندر *Sikender*. See also *Khondemir*, *Tarikh montekhbeb*, *Shah namé*, &c.

P. 158. [e] See Pocock Specimen Hist. Arab. p. 65, 66. 74. Novairi's Hist. of the Hemyaret Kings, &c.

تاريخ المسلمين *Tarikhu'l Moslemin*, or the History of the Saracens, p. 135. D'Herbelot, p. 1017.

P. 160. [f] See Khondemir, Sherfeddin Ali Yezdi's Life of Tamerlane; Abul Pharaje Dyn. 10. D'Herbelot passim, &c.

P. 162. [g] The number nine has been long in great veneration among the Tartars. All presents made to their princes consist, in general, of nine of each article. At all their feasts this number and its combinations are always attended to in their dishes of meat, and in their skins of wine or other liquors. At one entertainment, mentioned by the Tartar king Abulgazi Khan, there were 9000 sheep, 900 horses and 99 vessels of brandy, &c. Even the roving Tartars rob the caravans by this rule; and will rather take nine of any thing than a greater number. Abulgazi Khan, in the preface to his history, says, "I have divided it into nine parts, to conform myself to "the custom of other writers, who all have this number "in particular esteem." It appears to have been likewise a favourite mysterious number amongst the Goths. We are told, that every nine years there was a solemn festival, when nine animals of every species were sacrificed to their gods. Oden, they say, resolving to die as a warrior before the approach of age and infirmity, called a general assembly of the Goths, and wounded himself in nine

mortal places. See Adam of Bremen in Grotii Prolegomenis, p. 104. Mallet, Introduction à l'Hiſtoire de Dannemarc. —— The reſemblance of the Tartar and European diets ſeems to have ſtruck Voltaire. "Il parait "que les Kans Tartares etaient en uſage d'aſſembler des "Diétes vers le Printems: ces Diétes s'apelaient *Courilté.* "Eh! qui ſait ſi ces aſſemblées et nos Cours Plenieres, "au mois de Mars et de Mai, n'ont pas une origine com"mune? *Eſſai ſur l'Hiſtoire Generale,* ch. xlviii." —Abul Pharaje, p. 466. calls this Great Council قريلتاي *Kuriltai* or قريلتاي *Kariltai.* Ali Yezdi, in his life of Tamerlane, writes it قوريلتاي *kurultai.* See a magnificent deſcription of one, chap. 3. In the Khoraſmian dialect it is قورلتان *kuriltan.*

P. 163. [b] Blackſtone's Commentaries, Vol. II. p. 83.

P. 166. [a] Sadi, a Perſian moral writer of the firſt claſs, in the preface to his Boſtan, making an eulogium on Providence, ſays, with much ſerioufneſs, That Omnipotence had provided ſo liberally for the nouriſhment of all his creatures, that even the Simurgh finds on the mountain of Kaf ſufficient for her ſuſtenance, notwithſtanding her immeaſurable ſize. See Dict. سيمرغ *Simurgh,* عنقا *Anka,* and قاف *Kaf.*

P. 169. [b] In many parts of the Eaſt, they ſtrongly perfume the bodies of the dead, that the demons may not approach them. — See Dict. پري *Peri*; ديو *Dive*; سليمان *Soliman*; شادوكام *Shadukam*; باديات الجن *badyatu'l'jinn*; جان بن جان *Jan ben Jan.* *Angelo* ſays, that the *Sabians* make the creation 370,340 years before the Chriſtian era, See Gazophylacium Ling. Perſ. p. 361. — حارس *Hares*

ſignifies, a Guardian, governor, or protector; but on his fall his name was changed to ابا *Iba* The refractory; ابليس *Eblis* The deſperate; and شيطان *Sheitan* The proud.—Many of the ideas relative to *Kaf* are even adopted in the Alcoran: they were the general belief in the days of Mohammed; and it was not till geography became better underſtood, in the Eaſt, that they diſcovered the ſeveral diviſions of *Kaf* to be *Caucaſus*, *Imaus*, *Atlas*, and other mountains in Aſia and Africa.—The *Peris* are by ſome writers ſuppoſed to be all females, and the *Dives* males; but without having any communication; each having the ſeparate power of continuing their ſpecies: yet, in the *Tahmuras namé*, we find the brothers of the *Peri Merjan*; and the *Caherman namé* mentions often the kings of *Shadukam*.

P. 172. [c] The moſt famous taliſmans, which rendered them proof againſt the arms and magic of the Dives, were the مهر سليمان *mohur Solimani*, or The Seal of *Soliman Jared*, the fifth monarch of the world; which gave to its poſſeſſor the command of elements, demons, and of every created thing. The سپر *Siper*, or Buckler of *Jan ben Jan*, more famous in the Eaſt than the Shield of *Achilles* among the *Greeks*. The جبه *jebeh* or the Impenetrable Cuiraſs; and the تيغ اتش *tigh atiſh*, or the Flaming ſword. Among the dreadful creatures of the imagination, which winged the heroes of *Perſia* from region to region, were the *Rakſhé*, whoſe ordinary food was ſerpents and dragons. He had long rendered the Dry Iſland inacceſſible, till ſubdued by Houſheng, king of Perſia, or by his father Siamek Shah, who tamed, and mounted him in all their wars with the Dives. The *Soham* had the head of a horſe with four

eyes, and the body of a flame-coloured dragon: he was conquered by a famous Persian warrior called *Sam Neriman*. The *Ouranabad* is described as a fierce-flying hydra. The *Ejder*, *ezshder* or *ezshdeha*, are dragons of different kinds. The *Syl* appears to be the Basilisk, having a face somewhat human, the sight of which makes every creature to fly; the near approach being certain death. See Dictionary صحام *soham*, ورانابد *ouranabad*, رکشه *rakshé*, اجدر *ejder*, اژدر *ezshder*, اژدها *ezshdeha*, صل *syl*.

The present made by the Simurgh of her feathers to Tahmuras, according to Eastern writers, gave rise to the fashion of plumed helmets.—This prince was surnamed *Beniavend*, Armed at all points; and *Divebend*, Chainer of Dives. *Merjan* signifies A pearl.

See *Shah namé* خوان ششم و کشتن رستم ارژنك ديو *Khan shешum, wa kushten Rostam Arzshenk Dive*, The sixth adventure, and the slaughter of the *Dive Arzshenk* by *Rostam*. In the next is his combat with the ديو سپيد *Dive sepid* (white Dive). *Firdousi*, who may be called the *Homer* of *Persia*, employed thirty years in the composition of this work. He died at an advanced age, in the year 1018. See also Gazophylacium Ling. Pers. p. 127.

P. 175. [e] See Dissertations prefixed to the Rev. Mr. Warton's History of English Poetry; and Observations on the Faery Queen, p. 63.—In the Persian Romances, we find nations with the heads of fishes, dragons, &c. as سرماهي *ser mahi*, سرازدها *ser ezshdeha*. We have also the نيم سر *nim ser* The half heads, and دوال پاي *duwal pai* The leather strap legs. But one of the most singular creatures is the نيم جزه *nim jazé* or نيم چهر *nim chehr*;

which is ſuppoſed to be a human figure ſplit in two; the male being the right half, and the female the left: they have, of conſequence, half a face, one eye, one arm, and one foot, on which they run with incredible ſwiftneſs; and are imagined to be very dangerous and cruel.—تنين *tennin*, ثعبان *ſaban*, and other Arabic words uſed to denote Dragons, are only, radically, Large Serpents. عنقا *Anka* ſignifies An eagle, length of neck, &c. from the root عنق *ank*, A neck. عفريت *Afrit* A cruel or dangerous man, from the root عفر *yfr*; hence A giant, genie, demon, &c. —غول *Ghul* Any thing terrifying, which ſuddenly deprives people of their ſenſes. جن *Jenn* A demon, a ſpirit. This root ſignifies, *inter alia*, Covering, concealed, interior, dark. عزيف *Azif* A nocturnal ſound heard in the deſert, which they believed to be the howling of demons.— قطرب *Kutrub* A wolf; alſo a deep melancholly, which makes people fancy themſelves wolves, and run howling to the woods. It is alſo uſed to ſignify the male *Ghul*.—صيدانة *Seidanet* A bad woman, a ſcold: alſo the Lamia of the Deſert; an imaginary monſter with a woman's head. بلوكة *Beluket* A deſert: alſo a place in Arabia, which they believe to be the mouth of hell; and to be inhabited by demons.—See alſo Dict. جان *jan*, and جنون *jenun*.

P. 176. [f] [g] See Dictionary ماه *mah*.

P. 177. [h] Father Angelo obſerves, that Magic is an art publicly taught by the Perſians and Arabians. He knew a rich enchanter of Baſſora, a man much reſpected; whoſe ſcholars were ſo numerous, that they poſſeſſed one entire quarter of the city. At the ſound of a certain

drum, accompanied by a kind of chaunt, they became, like demoniacs, ſuddenly inſpired with a real or affected phrenzy; during which they devoured fire publicly in the ſtreets. This is a trick not uncommon with European jugglers. Theſe magicians, by way of diſtinction, wore their hair very long. See *Gazophylacium Linguæ Perſarum*, p. 155. Angelo went miſſionary to the Eaſt in 1663. See alſo Hyde's Religio Veterum Perſarum, cap. 18 et 19.

P. 180. [1] The words expreſſive of Taliſmans, Amulets, Faſcination, and Spells, are very numerous both in *Perſian* and *Arabic*. I ſhall mention a few. نشرة *nuſhret* An amulet for preventing or curing inſanity, or other malady. قبله *keblé* A philtre by which necromancers pretend to reconcile enemies. غژغاو *ghezſhghaw* or غجغاو *ghejghaw* Tufts made of the hair of ſea-cows, and hung round the necks of horſes, to defend them from faſcination. شبارق *ſhebarik* A tree of which they make amulets for the ſame purpoſe. عزيمة *azimet* An amulet, incantation, or ſpell againſt ſerpents, diſeaſe, or other evil. سلوانة *ſulwanet* Shells, rings, or beads uſed as amulets. سلوان *ſulwan* denotes, Water poured from a kind of ſhell, or upon earth taken from the grave of a dead man, which they drink to the health of a perſon; as a cure for love, or any ſevere affliction. عطفة *atfet* or عنطفة *antefet* Small beads hung by women round their necks, as a charm to gain the affections of their lovers. عقرة *akret* A ſpherical amulet, worne by ſome women round their waiſts, to prevent pregnancy; and by others to favour a conception. اخذة *akhzet* An amulet in form of a knot, which women wear to keep their huſbands faithful. نيرنك *nirenk*, نيرك

nirek, حمايل *hemail*, تعويذ *tawiz*, معقاد *mikad*, متمم *mutemmim*, غز *gezz*, خرز *kherez*, كحال *kehal*, وجيهة *wejibet*, رعب *rab*, قرزحلة *kyrzehlet*, معوذ *mawiz*, بريم *berim*, ſignify amulets, made of ſhells, beads, tufts of wool or hair, dead mens bones, &c. نجو *neju*, فرهست *ferheſt*, رقي *reki*, شوه *ſhuh*, لعطة *latet*, نظرة *nezret*, &c. imply Faſcination or malignant eyes. خرچاره *kherchare* is An aſs's head placed upon a pole in a garden, &c. to guard it againſt faſcination. بازور *bazur* and بازوبند *bazubend* ſignify *amulets* or any kind of ligatures uſed in inchantment; either from Bazur the name of a famous magician, or becauſe they are in general faſtened round the arm, which the other word implies. چشم بنام *cheſhm benam* An amulet for averting the faſcination of malignant eyes.

The following account of the diſcovery of hidden treaſure is given by the Vizir Nezam.—A prince, named Emir Iſmael, in the beginning of the tenth century, having defeated another chief, called Amrou Leis, who was ſuppoſed to be very rich, ſearch was made for his treaſure; but in vain. One of Iſmael's female ſlaves accidentally undreſſing to bathe on the terraſs of the palace, having laid down her girdle, ſet with large rubies, on a white cloth; a hungry kite obſerving it, and ſuppoſing the red ſtones to be bits of meat, pounced upon the girdle and carried it off. The damſel inſtantly gave the alarm to the guard; and a number of horſemen were diſpatched to keep the kite in view; who dropt it after a long purſuit, when it fell into a well. A man was immediately let down, who diſcovered in the ſide of it a large cavity, where a vaſt number of cheſts had been lodged, which proved to

be the very treaſure the Emir had been ſo long in queſt of, to the amount of about 4,000,000l. ſterling.—Burying treaſure is alſo common among the Tartars: and ſheets of gold, jewels, and rich moveables, are often interred along with the chiefs and their wives. See Abulgazi Khan's hiſtory; alſo Archeologia of the Society of Antiquaries, Vol. II. p. 222.

P. 183. [a] The Perſians in general calculate the era of Yezdijird from the 16th of June A. D. 632. And the Arabians from the year 651.

P. 186. [c] The ancient Perſians durſt not, by their religion, extinguiſh fire with water, but endeavoured to ſmother it with earth, ſtones, or any thing ſimilar. This method would not ſoon extinguiſh a blazing foreſt.—The Parſis of Guzerat are ſtill guided by the ſame hurtful ſuperſtition. See Anquetil's Zend Aveſta, Vol. II. p. 567.

P. 187. [d] كوسه نشين *Kouſa niſhin* ſignifies, The beardleſs old man ſitting or mounted. During the time of the Mohammedan Sultans of Perſia, this ceremony was called, in Arabic, ركوب الكوسج *rokubu'l'kouſej* The proceſſion of *Kouſej*, which is ſynonymous. — D'Herbelot obſerves, that a burleſque farce, ſomewhat reſembling this, was anciently cuſtomary in Italy about the middle of Lent. —September in Perſia is named *Mihr*, the angel ſuppoſed to ſuperintend the orb of the Sun; and the 16th day of every month is alſo called *Mihr*: in conſequence of which, they imagined, that the horn of an ox (a creature ſacred to the Sun) killed on that day, muſt be impregnated with extraordinary anti-demoniacal virtues.—M. Anquetil ſays, that the Parſis always carry about them papers ſo prepared, as a defence againſt the Dives, and a preſervative from

every diſtemper of body and mind. Zend Aveſta, Vol. II. p. 113.

P. 190. [g] نوشتهٔ کژدم *nuſhtei guzſhdum* or رقعهٔ کژدم *rukai guzſhdum* Scorpion ſpells. See alſo Dict. ماه *mah*.

مرد گیران *merd giran* Taking or commanding men. The author of the *Farhang Jehangiri* makes this feſtival to have continued during the five laſt days of this month: but others confine it to the fifth. At different periods, and in different provinces, both cuſtoms might have been reſpectively adopted. See alſo Hyde's Religio Veterum Perſarum, cap. 19 and 20.

P. 191. [h] طرق *teryk* Throwing pebble-ſtones or gravel, to prognoſticate future events. عیاف *iyaf* Divination from the flight of birds. قاري *kari* is the name of a bird with a long beak, which the Arabians conſider as a bird of good omen, which they are always happy to meet. کادس *kades* Any thing taken as an omen, generally in a bad ſenſe; as a deer deſcending a mountain, or appearing at the beholder's back. شعبده باز *ſhabid baz* An enchanter; one eſpecially who makes incantations by the help of aſhes, vitriol, or any kind of lixivium. ولهان *welhan* A demon, which they pretend to lay, by ſprinkling water, and pronouncing exorciſms. هلوان *hulwan* is an enchanter's fee. See Dictionary مسلعة *muſelaat* and باد انگیز *bad engiz*. See D'Herbelot Bibliotheque Orientale, p. 87. alſo under عمرو *Amru* and عمر *Omr* or *Omar*.

P. 193. [i] It is not a hundred years ſince the conjuration of witches, demons and fairies, was commonly practiſed and taught in London by Lilly and others. Even the Hon.

[library stamp]

Mr. Boyle, (see his works, V. 6. p. 59.) and other men of great learning and sound judgment, in other respects, were strongly impressed with a belief in those supernatural beings, and of the power of spells in commanding their service. In the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford are various formularies of invocation and incantations, collected by the very learned and sensible founder; who was strongly tinctured with those prejudices. See Ashmole's Collect. of MSS. N° 8259. 1406. 2. See also the Lives of John Lilly and Elias Ashmole, Esq. likewise Dr. Percy's Relicts of Ancient English Poetry, Vol. III. p. 213, 214.—Conjurers, witches, and sorcerers, are accurately described in our law books. Hawkins (in his Pleas of the Crown) says, "*Conjurers* are those who, by force of certain magic words, endeavour to raise the devil, and oblige him "to execute their commands. *Witches* are such who, "by way of conference, bargain with an evil spirit to do "what they desire of him; and *Sorcerers* are those who, "by the use of certain superstitious words, or by the "means of images, &c. are said to produce strange effects, above the ordinary course of nature." All which were anciently punished as heretics by sentence of the Ecclesiastical courts, and burnt by the writ *De heretico comburendo*. See Lib. 1. p. 5. By the Common Law, they could only be pilloried. 3 Inst. 44. H. P. C. 38. But by Stat. 1. James I. c. 12. these offenders are divided into two degrees: those of the first degree, with their accessories before the fact, suffering as felons without benefit of clergy. These are of four kinds; "1. Such as shall use any invocation or conjuration of any evil spirit. 2. That consult, covenant with, entertain, employ, or reward any "evil spirit, to any intent. 3. As take up any dead per-

"son's body, or any part thereof, to be used in any manner of witchcraft. 4. Or that exercise any witchcraft, inchantment, charm or sorcery, whereby any person shall be killed, destroyed, consumed, or lamed in his body or any part thereof." And tho' a spirit doth not actually appear upon invocation, &c: or tho' a dead person, or part of it, be taken up to be used, and not actually used; they are still within the statute.—This law, which would disgrace the most stupid of nations in the most barbarous state of ignorance, was not repealed till the 9th Geo. II. If we keep such circumstances in view, and pay a proper attention to Chronology, when we read, we shall not, with any regard to justice, look down with contempt upon the manners and beliefs of distant times and distant countries.

P. 197. [a] Some combats with the Dives have been slightly mentioned (p. 170); previous to which, great preparations were made by the heroes to arm themselves with spells, as a defence against their enchantments; accompanied with ceremonies differing little from those afterwards practised by our European knights, when setting out to engage with necromancers or giants. See Dict. اهرمن— A duel in Arabic is called وقيعة الاثنين *wekyatu'l'esnein* The combat of two. —See Dict. اسفنديار *Asfendiar*. He was son to Kishtasb, the fifth king of the Kaianian dynasty, and father of Ardeshir Dirazdest, the Artaxerxes Longimanus of the Greeks.—See *Shah namé* for a great variety of those single combats; also the *Housheng namé*, *Iskender namé*, *Tahmuras namé*, and other Eastern books of Poetry and Romance. — See Khondemir; The Leb Tarikh, in the Life of Kai Khosrou; D'Herbelot Bibliotheque Orient. p. 716; and Dict. دوازده رخ *Duazdeh rokh* The twelve

heroes. This is a combat precifely fimilar to that of the Horatii and Curiatii of Rome and Alba.

البطال *Albatal* fignifies, The knight. He was alfo named سيد بطل *Seidi batal* The lord knight. He was killed in the year of the Hejra 121. (A. D. 738.) جعفر الصادق *Giaffar al Sadac*, Giaffar the Juft, was born at Medina, in the year 83 of the Hejra (A. D. 699.) and died in the year 148 (A. D. 764.) M. D'Herbelot feems to think that thofe two were the fame perfon: but an attention to their dates, in which the Eaftern writers are very particular, does not feem to juftify the furmife. This learned Orientalift fays, that in the French king's library there is an Arabian manufcript, called *Seirat al mujahedin* (The lives of warriors); in which there is an abridgement of Albatal's life: alfo that there is another larger work filled with moft wonderful feats of arms. Bibl. Orient. p. 193. 399.

P. 198. [b] See *Ben Shunah*, *Khondemir*, *D'Herbelot*, p. 371.

P. 199. [c] جريدة *jeridé* is a branch of a palm tree ftript of the leaves.—قنا *cana* are canes, the hollow parts of which are filled with fome folid body. Of thefe they generally make the Arabian fpears. دريّة *derit* is a ring, at which they dart a javelin, or endeavour to carry off on the point of a lance. — See alfo Hiftoria de las Guerras Civiles de Granada. — The *Jerid Oiné*, D'Herbelot fays, was a common exercife among the Turkifh cavaliers in the Atmeidan or Hippodrome at Conftantinople. Bibl. Orient. p. 383. — The word *caitiff*, which in times of chivalry was often given by one knight as a term of reproach to another, has been fuppofed to be derived from the Italian *cattivo* or the Spanifh *cautivo*, a captive, &c.

It is possible, however, that it may be only a slight alteration of the Arabian word خطاف *khattaf* A ravisher. As one of the great ends of the institution of chivalry was to protect the sex, a violation of this important point was justly marked with every circumstance of infamy. It was chiefly applied to those giants or governors of castles, who made a practice of carrying off and imprisoning the undefended fair: and seems, in consequence, to be much more applicable to them than Captive; which carried along with it no such disgraceful idea.—I have sometimes been also induced to think, that there is some affinity between the word *Knight* and نخط *Nikht*, which signifies those who tilt with or throw spears, in order to show strength and dexterity.

P. 200. [a] See Essay on the Poetry of Eastern nations, by W. Jones, Esq; subjoined to the Life of Nadir Shah, 8vo, p. 133. For various specimens of their elegies and other compositions, See *Poeseos Asiaticæ Commentarii, auctore Guilielmo Jones*, 8vo. See also *Supplement à l'Histoire de Nader Chah*, 4to. tom. II. p. 231. et seq. by the same learned and ingenious author.—See Dict. واله *waleh*, مدله *mudalleh*, مهوس *muhawwis*, هايم *haim*, شيدا *shida*, شفته *shufté*, شريده *sheridé*, الفته *alufté*, عاشق *ashik*, &c. signifying, Distracted, insane, desperate, furious, frantic, melancholy, mad with love. مجنون *Mejnoun* is the surname of one of the most celebrated Eastern lovers, and it implies Furious, frantic, mad, see ليلي و مجنون The loves of *Leila and Mejnoun*, by the celebrated Persian poet *Jami*. اشوا *ashwa* denotes Blind with the madness of love. علوق *uluk* signifies Love and Death. متيم *metim* The Captive

of Love; one who submits to slavery or the meanest employment, to have an opportunity of serving or admiring his mistress.

P. 203. [e] Ockley's Hist. of Saracens, p. 239. &c.

p. 204. [f] See ch. 24, 25, and other passages of Ali Yezdi's History of Tamerlane, for many grand festivals given by that prince; especially on the marriages of his grandchildren in 1404. The palace which he then built, on a plain called *Kanigul* (the mine of flowers), was a square of 1500 cubits, chiefly of marble, encrusted on the outside of the principal apartments with porcelaine; and in the inside with ivory, ebony, gold, and precious stones. —A trifling observation which occurs in this place shows, that the contempt with which Europeans honour the Tartars and other Eastern people, is perfectly reciprocal— "The European ambassadors were also invited to the "great banquet, and partook of the diversions; for even "the Kasses (a very minute animal) have their place in "the ocean."

P. 208. [g] Mahmoud's queen, mentioned in the text, was the daughter of the Khan of Turkestan. جميله قندهارى *Jemila Khandahari* may be interpreted the *Beauty of Khandahar*. Mahmoud was the Great Sultan of Ghezna, who conquered Hindostan, and many other kingdoms in the East, at the end of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh centuries. See p. 31. and Notes to p. 36. of this Dissertation. See also Abulpharaje, p. 429.

Sultan Malekshah, surnamed جلال الدولت و الدين *Jelal eddoulatu eddin* (The glory of the state and of religion), of whom mention has been so often made in this Dissertation, was the third Sultan of the Seljukian dynasty; and great grandson of *Seljuk*, a Turcoman or Tartar

nobleman, who was the founder of the family. The magnificent ſolemnity mentioned by the Vizir Nezam happened about the year 1076; though hiſtorians have hitherto fixed it ſome years earlier, on the coronation of Malek-ſhah; but the Vizir's own account is undoubtedly ſuperior authority. See D'Herbelot, p. 544, &c.

P. 210. [a] See *Las Guerras Civiles de Granada*. As it is ſeveral years ſince I ſaw this book, and now quote from memory, I cannot refer to the particular paſſages.—Beſides the inſtruments mentioned in the text, the Aſiatics have the *Kiran*, the *Mizher*, the *Kanun* or *Kenin*; the *Kemanché*, the *Kenaret*, the *Arteb*, the *Tunbur*, the *Zentur*, the *Kendelaſh*, and ſeveral others, which are different kinds of the lute, harp, dulcimer, pſalter, viola d'amore, and other inſtruments of the ſtringed ſpecies. The *Kunjbad* appears to be the Eolian or wind harp; the *Tulumbé* is a hydraulic inſtrument or water-organ; *Miſkal*, a ſpecies of organ, or Pan's reed-pipe, of unequal lengths. *Drums* are apparently an Arabian invention, and they have them of many ſorts. *Tebl* is a drum, *Teblek* a ſmall drum, tabor, or tambourin; alſo one made of two kettles, joined bottom to bottom, and covered with ſkins. *Ruyim khun*, *Sitam*, *Kubé*, are other kinds of kettle-drums. *Duff*, *Dubdub*, *Tembel*, *Dereb*, *Shendef*, *Shedef*, with many more, are drums, tabors, and other ſimilar inſtruments. *Kus* is a large royal military drum, generally beat in the palace, or in the camp when the king is preſent. They have likewiſe a vaſt number of wind inſtruments, eſpecially for war and the chace; as the *Gawdum*, a trumpet, with which they ſound the charge to battle; the *Buk* or *Buri*, a kind of Clarion, or Cor de chaſſe. The *Shebir*, the *Nefir*, the *Naker*, the *Kerna* or *Kerennay*, are trumpets of different

kinds: the laſt was that uſed by *Tamerlane*; the ſound of which is deſcribed as uncommonly dreadful; and ſo loud as to be heard at the diſtance of ſeveral miles. The *Nei*, the *Zarna*, the *Keiſabes*, the *Shaben*, the *Neidil*, the *Neiſhé*, the *Kawwal*, and the *Sanai*, are all of the hautboy, pipe, or flute ſpecies; though apparently not ſo melodious in general as thoſe of Europe.

P. 212. [b] The Arabians and Perſians, it may be here obſerved, have a gamut or muſical ſcale, which they call *Durri muſeſſel* (Separate pearls); whence the old mode of teaching vocal muſic in Europe, by what is vulgarly called *Sol-fa-ing*, ſeems to have been borrowed; their notes being named *A la mi ré*; *B fa pé mi*; *C ſol fa ut*, &c. See Dictionary در مفصل See alſo Gazophylacium Linguæ Perſarum, p. 175. D'Herbelot, p. 337.

P. 215. [a] "O true believer, the law of retaliation is "allowed you for the ſlain: the free ſhall die for the free; "and the ſervant for the ſervant; and a woman for a wo- "man: but he whom his brother ſhall forgive, may be "proſecuted and obliged to make ſatisfaction, according "to what is juſt, and a fine ſhall be ſet on him with hu- "manity. This is indulgence from your Lord, and mer- "cy *. — And when the ſlayer ſhall be pardoned (in con- "ſequence of making ſatisfaction), he who hereafter ſhall "tranſgreſs (by killing the ſlayer) ſhall ſuffer a moſt grie- "vous puniſhment. And in this retaliation ye have life." — In another part he ſays, "Whoever ſhall take a ven- "geance equal to the injury which hath been done; and "ſhall be afterwards unjuſtly treated, verily God will aſ- "ſiſt him." See Alcoran, chap. ii. iv. and xxii. — M. D'Herbelot, after the paſſage marked above with the aſteriſm *, inſerts theſe words, "Mais celui qui pardonnera "au meurtrier obtiendra la miſericorde de Dieu, &c." but

I can diſcover nothing correſponding to it in this part of the Alcoran. See Bibliotheque Orientale, p. 294.

The Sonna is a collection of the ſayings of Mohammed, or the traditions of his widows and companions. By the Turks and other followers of the ſect of Omar, they are conſidered with a reſpect little inferior to the Alcoran; but they are rejected by the Perſians and the other adherents of Ali. See Dictionary سنه *ſonna* and دية *diyet.*

The *Fredum* was a late introduction into the ancient European Code; being unknown in the older capitularies; and ſeems to have been intended by the magiſtrate as an additional check to private revenge. It was a ſum paid by a criminal to the king, or to his feudal ſuperior, for protection againſt the relations of the deceaſed, after they had accepted a compoſition. It was in general equal to a third part of this compoſition; but varied often, in proportion to the difficulty of protecting the perſon who had committed the violence. See *Monteſquieu de l' Eſprit des Loix*, liv. 30. ch. xx. Robertſon's Cha. V. vol. i. p. 361.

قصاص *keſas*; قود *kawed*; اباءة *ibaat*; بوا *bawa*; پاداش *padaſh*; تاوان *tawan*; تار *tar*; مقتص *muktyſs*; ثار *ſar*—ſignify, The Law of Retaliation, or puniſhment by that law; killing one for the murder of another. اقصاص *ikſas* and امثال *imſal*, are nearly ſynonimous; but more ſtrictly denote, Eye for eye, limb for limb, &c. طلف *zelif* Shedding much blood with impunity. بضرا مضرا *byzran myzran* Blood ſhed unrevenged. هدر *hedir* Permitting blood to be ſhed unrevenged: this word alſo implies, a worthleſs fellow. موتور *mawtur*, ياتارة *yatarat* One who does not revenge the death of his friend (from cowardice or other baſe motive). متدي *muttedi* Receiving money, &c. as an expiation for murder. غور *ghur* Expiating murder

by a mulct. ارش *ersh*, اشناق *ashnak* Fines for the shedding of blood.

The first month *Muharrem*, the seventh *Rejeb*, the eleventh *Dhulkaadé*, and the twelfth *Dhulhajjé*, were esteemed sacred in Arabia from the oldest times: and, excepting by one or two tribes, were so religiously observed, that if a man met during that time the murderer of his father, he durst not offer him any violence. The history or traditions of the old Arabs do not mention above six transgressions of this law; and these are stiled Impious wars. As three of those sacred months, however, followed close together, they used sometimes to dispense with the observation of *Muharrem*; keeping the next month (*Sefer*) sacred in its room. Mahomet adopted these observances; with an exception to the mode of transferring a month; which he declared to be a profane innovation: but he gave his followers permission to attack at all times Infidels, or those who did not pay a proper regard to the institution. See Prelim. Disc. to Sale's Alcoran, p. 196.

Battles fought during the sacred months were called افجرة *affjeret*; from فجار *fejar* Wickedness.

The *Treuga Dei* or *Truce of God*, was adopted about the year 1032, in consequence of a pretended revelation of a bishop of Aquitaine. It was published in the time of a general calamity; and it made so deep an impression on the minds of men, that a general cessation of private hostilities was observed, we are told, for seven years; and a resolution formed, that no man should, in time to come, molest his adversary from Thursday evening till Monday morning. The *Pax Regis* or *Royal Truce* was an ordinance of Lewis VIII. King of France, A. D. 1245; by which the friends or vassals of a murdered or injured person were prohibited from commencing hostilities till

forty days after the commiſſion of the offence. Dr. Robertſon's Charles V. vol. i. p. 336-8.

P. 217. [b] Ockley's Hiſt. Arab. p. 148.

P. 218. [c] See Abulgazi Khan's Hiſt. Tatar. Part 9. c. 3.

P. 220. [a] See D'Herbelot, p. 7, 333. Sale's Prelim. Diſc. p. 38, &c. Code of Gentoo Laws, p. 88. See alſo Dictionary لوم *lum:* لوع *lua:* هاع *haa:* مكرز *mekerz:* ليم *leim:* لامان *laman:* هجرس *hejeres:* ناكس *nakes:* وزغ *wezegh:* which ſignify A miſer; avaricious; covetouſneſs, cowardice, baſeneſs, worthleſſneſs, and every villainous property of man. نان و نمك خايني *nanu nemek khayini* A bread and ſalt traitor; he who betrays his patron, maſter, hoſt, or benefactor.

P. 221. [a] See the *Shah namé*, under the title of گذشتن سياوخس از كوه اتش *guzeſhteni Siavekhſh az kuhi atiſh* The paſſing of *Siavekhſh* through the flaming pile. See alſo Preface to Code of Gentoo Laws, p. lviii, &c.

P. 223. [a] D'Herbelot, p. 688.

P. 225. [b c] اتو *atu,* برطيل *bertil,* رشو *reſhu* Bribing a judge or great man, to obtain any thing contrary to juſtice. رشوت *reſhwet,* ياذه *yadé* or ياذه *yazé,* براكنده *berakendeh* بدكند *badkund,* باره *baré,* ارش *erſh* A bribe to corrupt a judge. رايش *raiſh* A broker employed to bribe a judge. مدلي *mudli* Offering money to a judge, in order to corrupt him. نظارة *nezaret* denotes the technical language of the Arabian lawyers. محاش *mehaſh* Different tribes of Pagan Arabians aſſembling round a fire; cuſtomary when they entered into treaties. هولة *hawlet* A ſacred fire, over which witneſſes uſed to ſwear.

P. 226. [d] نگارستان *nigariſtan* The gallery of pictures: a work ſomewhat reſembling the Guliſtan; being an agreeable miſcellany in proſe and verſe. The anecdotes in it are in general conſidered as founded on real hiſtory.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

SECT. I.

Supplemental obſervations on the Greek Hiſtorians. Their general merit acknowledged. Their inaccuracies complained of by their greateſt admirers. Singular diſagreement of chronologers and commentators. Further ſtrictures upon the expedition of Xerxes. Grounds upon which Aſiatic authors might conſider the Greeks as tributary or dependent upon the Perſian empire. Obſervations on Mr. Bryant's animadverſions on this head.

IN the preceding ſheets, I have ventured to queſtion the authority of the writers of Greece; chiefly with regard to Eaſtern ſubjects: and have not, I am afraid, expreſſed myſelf, on ſome points, with clearneſs ſufficient to be rightly underſtood. For although I have propoſed doubts of ſome facts, I would

not be thought to queſtion all. What I have merely given as the relations of Aſiatic writers, I would not be ſuppoſed implicitly to adopt. And whilſt my purpoſe has been ſimply to ſubmit to the attention of future hiſtorians the incongruities of Weſtern and Eaſtern authors, I would not be underſtood to give a preference, where I have only meant an impartial inveſtigation. [a]

THE animadverſions on this ſubject, which I have had any opportunity of learning, have turned principally — Upon the general credit to which the Greeks are intitled, from their antiquity—Upon the expedition of Xerxes— And upon the idea of the Grecians being tributary or ſubject to the Perſian kings. [b]

To theſe points I ſhall beg leave to ſpeak: and flatter myſelf, whatever difference of opinion may be entertained on ſubjects ſo remote, and ſo full of uncertainty, that no man of candour will greatly condemn me, for endeavouring to explain or to ſupport my former poſitions. I again declare, that I cannot have the leaſt partiality for one ſingle circumſtance, which, on the balance of fair argument, may appear to be wrong: for whilſt I ſee no neceſſity in the belief of any hiſtorical abſurdity, I can ſee as little propriety

in refusing my assent to whatever has solid pretensions to truth or probability.

THAT Europe is much indebted to the Grecian writers, every man of reason will be forward to acknowledge. They unquestionably did a great deal: but could they do all? Was nothing to be left to other nations, and to other times? Like a fine lustre in a large hall, they might diffuse their rays a great way around: but could they illuminate all the extremities; could they throw light into every dark recess? In places and in times too remote for the observation of the European Ancients, can it be too great a stretch of fancy to suppose, that native writers of distant countries might, possibly, furnish some feeble lights, to guide us through obscurities; which, after all, we ought rather to regret than to wonder at? For, when we consider the infinite disadvantages under which, in those early times, a writer must have struggled: when we consider the comparative difficulty of intercourse and information: when we consider the facility of imposition, to which a vivacity of imagination is naturally exposed: with the numberless fictions and prejudices, to which misconception or superstition had given a currency: we shall be less surprized,

take them for all in all, that they had ſome failings, than that they had ſo few.[d]

THAT the Greeks, however, with all their beauty of compoſition, are in various lights inconſiſtent, is no diſcovery of mine. Even the ancients, as well as their greateſt advocates among the moderns, have dwelt upon their faults. *Velificatus Athos, et quicquid Græcia mendax audet in hiſtoria*, was ſung by Juvenal many years ago. The judicious Quinctilian thought he paſſed not too keen a cenſure, when he wrote, *Græcis hiſtoricis plerumque poeticæ ſimilem eſſe licentiam.* Pliny, at the expence of every preceding hiſtorian, ſays, *Diodorum primum Græcorum deſiiſſe nugari:* whilſt Ludovicus Vives declares, *Nihil Diodoro eſſe nugacius.*[e]

CAN any thing be more ſevere than the ſtrictures of Strabo? "Though they (the "early Greek hiſtorians) have pretended to "give a hiſtory of Cyrus, and his particular "wars with thoſe who were called Meſſagetæ; yet nothing preciſe and ſatisfactory "could ever be obtained; not even in reſpect "to the war. There is the ſame uncertainty "with regard to the ancient hiſtory of the Perſians; as well as that of the Medes and Syrians: we can meet with little that can be "deemed authentic, on account of the weak-

"ness of those who wrote, and their uniform "love of fable. For finding that writers "who professedly deal in fiction without any "pretensions to the truth were regarded; "they thought that they should make their "writings equally acceptable, if in the system "of their history they were to introduce cir-"cumstances, which they had neither seen "nor heard, nor received upon the authority "of another person; proceeding merely upon "this principle, that they should be most "likely to please people's fancy, by having "recourse to what was marvellous and new. "On this account we may more safely trust "to Hesiod and Homer, when they present "us with a list of demigods and heroes, and "even to the tragic poets, than to Ctesias, "Herodotus, Hellanicus, and writers of that "class. Even the generality of historians "who write about Alexander are not safely "to be trusted: for they speak with great "confidence, relying upon the glory of the "monarch whom they celebrate, and the "remoteness of the countries in which he "was engaged; even at the extremities of "Asia; at a great distance from us and our "concerns. This renders them very secure. "For what is referred to a distance is dif-"ficult to be confuted." (lib. 11. p. 774.)—

In another place, Strabo goes on in the same strain: "The writers who must necessarily be appealed to, were in continual opposition, and contradicted one another. And how could it be otherwise? for if they erred so shamefully when they had ocular proof, how could they speak with certainty, where they were led by hearsay?" (lib. 15. p. 1006.)

But who has been more eloquent than Mr. Bryant upon the foibles of the Greeks? Who has treated, with a greater fluency of censure, their vanity, their inconsistency, and their fiction? And yet no man, who has read his works, will, I hope, suspect him of a wish to degrade them unjustly. "The Grecians, says this learned gentleman, were grossly ignorant in respect to foreign events." (Mythology Vol. I. p. 100.)—"They were a bigoted people, highly prejudiced in their own favour; and so devoted to idle tradition, that no arguments could wean them from their folly." (Vol. I. p. 143.)——"The native Helladians were very limited in their knowledge. They had taken in the gross whatever was handed down by tradition, and assumed to themselves every history which was imported. They moreover held every nation but their own as barbarous;

"so that their insuperable vanity rendered "it impossible for them to make any great "advances in historical knowledge." (Vol. I. p. 145.) — "They were under violent pre-"judices, and the subject matter of which "they treated, was in general so brief and li-"mited, that very little could be obtained "from it towards the history of other coun-"tries, or a knowledge of ancient times. "Even in respect to their own affairs, what-"ever light had been derived to them was so "perverted, and came through so dim a me-"dium, that it is difficult to make use of it "to any determinate and salutary purpose. "Yet the beauty of their composition has been "attended with wonderful influence. Many "have been so far captivated by this magic "as to give an implicit credence to all that "has been transmitted; and to sacrifice their "judgment to the pleasures of the fancy." (Vol. I. p. 146.)—"No people had a greater "love for science; nor displayed a more re-"fined taste in composition. Their study "was ever to please, and to raise admiration. "Hence they always aimed at the marvellous; "which they dressed up in the most winning "manner: at the same time they betrayed a "seeming veneration for antiquity. But their "judgment was perverted; and this venera-

"tion attended with little regard for the "truth." (Vol. I. p. 153.)—"There surely "never was any nation so incurious and indif- "ferent about truth. Hence have arisen those "contradictions and inconsistencies with which "their history is embarrassed." (Vol. I. p. 155.) —"In respect to foreign history and geogra- "phical knowledge, the Greeks in general "were very ignorant." (Vol. I. p. 158.)— "Thus have the Greeks by their affectation "continually ruined history: and the reader "may judge how difficult it is to see the truth "through the mist with which it is inviron- "ed." (Vol. II. p. 203)—Can it be necessary to add more? [g]

After such a weight of evidence, is there great presumption in supposing, amidst so much error, some amendment possible? Can there be any impropriety in the enquiry, how far the records and the historians of a people might, in respect to their own annals, correct the mistakes and the fictions of strangers? Or, can there be much harm, in directing, if possible, the attention of ingenious and learned travellers to the discovery of such ancient Eastern materials, as might tend either to authenticate, or to confute, the Eastern Historians of more modern times? [i]

°How flender indeed were the beft pretenfions of the Greeks to any real knowledge of the hiftory, language, or manners of ancient Perfia? Xenophon and Ctefias were amongft the few who could have even an opportunity of confulting authentic records. Yet, by a fingular fatality, there are not two productions of antiquity more queftioned, than the Cyropædia of Xenophon, and the Annals of Ctefias. [i]

Xenophon was in no place where archives could apparently be kept. He was in none of the capitals of the Perfian empire; and we cannot, I think, look for any in Afia Minor: whilft, in the courfe of his famous expedition, he was in fuch a perpetual hurry of march and action; that he could have but little leifure to ftudy any thing in a language and character, which in all probability he hardly knew.— Whatever he learnt, therefore, could be only oral fragments; the deficiencies of which he feems liberally to have fupplied from his own imagination. And that this was the idea, even of the ancients, we may learn from Plato and from Cicero; who have confidered the Inftitutions of Cyrus not as a hiftory founded on truth, but merely as Xenophon's ideas of a juft prince, and of an excellent government. [k]

Ctesias, we are informed, was a phyfi-

cian; and resided many years at the court of that prince, called by the Greeks Artaxerxes Mnemon. Here, it is said, he had access to the royal records. But how much has this been questioned? Even so early as Strabo, we find his annals considered as mere legends. They are in opposition to almost every other writer: and with the Bible, they have little discernible affinity. Dr. Jackson, it may be observed, indeed, has made an attempt to find out one. Thonus Concolerus, the 36th King of the Ctesian catalogue, he says, is the same as the Senacherib of Scripture: but how? In order to adjust the chronology, the Doctor finds it necessary to suppose four of Ctesias's Median kings, to have been Assyrian Prefects; and brings Thonus Concolerus 111 years nearer to the Christian era, than Ctesias had placed him: so very distant is this fanciful resemblance between the actions, the eras, and the names of those princes, whom the learned gentleman wishes to consider as the same person. Such methods of clearing up anachronisms, and reconciling Sacred with Prophane History, may appear wonderful to a plain man: but these operations of chronologers occur so often, that our surprize, if we read them with attention, has hardly time to fix upon one object, till it is called off to another and an-

other; and all equally difficult to be accounted for, on the ſimple principles of common ſenſe alone.[1]

But it is not my intention to dwell on ſuch ſubjects: the mere diſcovery of error is a painful purſuit. Volumes might indeed be filled with the inconſiſtencies of the Greeks: but many more with the contradictions of later writers. For notwithſtanding the ſentiments of Plato and Cicero, the Cyropædia has been followed, as an authentic hiſtory, by Africanus, Joſephus, Euſebius, Uſher, Prideaux. And the authors of the Univerſal Hiſtory conſider its authority as far preferable to that of Herodotus. Scaliger, Eraſmus, and many others, look upon it, on the contrary, as a mere collection of figments: and Dr. Jackſon, declaring it to be more feigned than real, ſays, that it has miſled every writer who has attempted to follow it. The Doctor at the ſame time ſtiles Herodotus the moſt accurate and faithful Hiſtorian: and conſiders Cteſias in a very different light from the learned in general. To Cteſias, on the other hand, Sir Iſaac Newton pays ſmall regard: but to Herodotus, notwithſtanding the anathema of Strabo, he looks up with high reſpect. He calls him, after Cicero, the Father of Hiſtory, and endeavours to reconcile

with him every point of early chronology.—It muſt, I think, be unneceſſary to proceed.—When ſuch men differ, who can decide? And from whence, let me again aſk, can all this contradiction originate? Could Joſephus, Euſebius, Syncellus, Scaliger, Petavius, Voſſius, Uſher, Prideaux, Newton, Jackſon, (men of ſuch uncommon learning, induſtry, and diſcernment) poſſibly find themſelves ſo often and ſo remarkably in oppoſition, were there not ſomewhere a radical error? Indeed we may conclude, with Voſſius, *Ubi tanta eſt contentio, ibi vel nullam vel incertam eſſe veritatem.* Such men, could truth have been diſcovered, muſt undoubtedly have found her: but, diſguiſed as ſhe has been by fiction; perplexity, by their endeavours, ſeems only to have become more perplexed. One frames a ſyſtem. Another beats it down. He builds again; and a third demoliſhes. All appeal to their favourite authors: all are deciſive and peremptory. *Ipſi et ſe invicem et ſe ipſos miſere lancinant et refutant.* All is confuſion: and we may ſay indeed, That Gods meet Gods and juſtle in the dark.[m]

But no ſubject has afforded a more extenſive field for diſſenſion than the Babyloniſh, Aſſyrian, Median, and Perſian dynaſties: and here the ſyſtematic knife has

been uſed with much addreſs. When chronologers meet with kings which puzzle them, without ceremony they cut them off; or perhaps they turn them upſide down: they faſhion Aſſyrians into Babylonians, Perſians into Medes: and, whilſt they find here a hundred years too much, and there a hundred years too little, they diſpute with keenneſs a few months in a prince's reign; who, in all probability, never reigned at all. Yet, were no other hiſtory to be perplexed with them, this might be harmleſs, perhaps amuſing. But how much learning has been moſt zealouſly miſplaced, to injure the Sacred Writings, by improper references and illuſtrations? By a ſingular impropriety, learned men have ſuppoſed errors, where they ſhould have ſuppoſed none: and they have gone upon authorities, which alone, from their uncertainty, ought to have been ſuſpected. So completely diſguiſed, or perhaps ſo completely imaginary, indeed, are thoſe Græco-Aſiatic dynaſties, if they may be ſo named, that I firmly believe there will hardly be found one inſtance, where they have been appealed to, in ſupport of Scripture, in which ſome obvious inconſiſtency may not be diſcovered. Without ſearching for one, I have ſeen many: but I ſhall at preſent confine myſelf to one example, which

I found, by chance, in Dr. Jackſon; an author of the higheſt reputation for chronological learning. It is upon a point too of much importance, The prophecy of Daniel's ſeventy weeks: and it greatly hurts his hypotheſis. "The famous prophecy, ſays the "Doctor, of Daniel's Seventy Weeks, or "490 years, to the baptiſm and preaching "of the Meſſiah, (Dan. ch. ix. 24.) commenced in the reign of Xerxes, as Joſephus aſſures us, and in the *twentieth year of his reign*, as we are told in *Nehemiah*, "ch. ii. 1. ſo it commenced in the year before Chriſt 464. Chriſt was baptized, and "began to preach his Goſpel, A. D. 28. in "the 15th year of Tiberius Cæſar. Now "463 years before the vulgar era of Chriſt, "and twenty-ſeven years after it, make exactly 490 years complete: and it was in "the 491ſt year after the twentieth of "Xerxes, when Chriſt was baptized, and "entered upon his prophetic office. Chriſt "was then thirty years of age; and therefore was born two years at leaſt before the "vulgar Chriſtian era." [a]

Now what poſſible concern, in ſtrict propriety, could the great object of the Meſſiah have to do with the reign of a Perſian king? Or could any thing vindicate a reference to

it; but ſome ſtrong and pointed light, which it might throw upon the ſubject? But on the contrary, this defeats the very purpoſe: it is weighed in the balance and found wanting. That Xerxes could not poſſibly be the Artaxerxes of Nehemiah is evident not merely from a diſagreement in name; for upon that alone it is unſafe to build; but from the different terms of their reigns. Xerxes, in the very ſection where this is introduced, the Doctor has been at much pains to prove, reigned juſt *twenty years and five months*; but Artaxerxes reigned at leaſt *thirty-two* years, as we may read in Nehemiah, ch. v. 14. "Moreover, from the time that I was appointed to be their governor in the land of Judah, from the *twentieth* year even unto the *two and thirtieth* year of Artaxerxes the king, that is, twelve years, I and my brethren have not eaten the bread of the governor." Voſſius indeed may have helped to miſlead Dr. Jackſon in this idea; for he too calls *Artaxerxes* in Nehemiah *Xerxes*: but they are evidently in the wrong. In name, in era, and in extent of reign, theſe two kings are clearly different: and to reconcile thoſe incoherencies there appears to be only two ways. Xerxes's reign muſt either be lengthened to a period which will unhinge at once

Greek chronology; or the Bible muſt be new modelled into a conſiſtency with it. This indeed has been too often attempted: but in vain. They are heterogeneous bodies, and never can incorporate.

How far, on the other hand, Eaſtern Hiſtorians might be found to coincide in general with Scripture, as I have already hinted, ſeems by no means impoſſible: but it is a conſideration of too much importance to be ſlightly decided. It would require more reading and more reflexion, than my preſent purſuits will allow: or my abilities or inclination can ever permit me to attempt. One opinion however I will not heſitate to give: They cannot well occaſion more confuſion than the learned have already created, by adhering, in their commentaries, to the chronology and narrative of the Greeks. Should the preſent Perſian hiſtorians ever be examined with care; could they be authenticated by means of earlier writers; and connected with the ancient royal records of Perſia; I think, it is by no means improbable, that we may diſcover the Perſian empire to have been, in very early ages, of great extent: and that thoſe imaginary dynaſties of Babyloniſh, Aſſyrian, and Median kings, which have ſo much confounded our chronogers, were, like thoſe of more authentic times,

only governors or feudatory princes under the kings of Perſia. Theſe might be more fixed or more fluctuating, according to the will of the paramount, or the conduct of the vaſſal. Different provinces would generally have different governors: but a ſon, a brother, or a royal favourite might, at times, have many. The king might ſometimes permit governments to be hereditary: ſometimes make them move in quicker ſucceſſion. We find often, in the Greek liſts, many of thoſe princes crouded into the compaſs of a few years: and this might ariſe from the policy or caprice of the Sovereign, who might remove or diſpatch his governors, as prudence or jealouſy dictated. Theſe governors, whether feudatory or temporary, might often fall into arrears of tribute; they might become intoxicated with power; and they might rebel. The governor of Media, or of Aſſyria, for example, might be ſent to chaſtiſe the viceroy of Babylonia; and, as a reward for his ſervices, he might have the province, which he had reduced to obedience, annexed to his own. [p]

Now ſuch arrangements, to diſtant obſervers, might eaſily give the appearance of the termination of one dynaſty; of the commencement of another; of interregnums; and of every operation of one independent prince againſt

another: whilſt the high royal titles, by which ſome of thoſe governors might be diſtinguiſhed, will prove nothing againſt the hypotheſis. Lofty titles have, in all ages, been liberally beſtowed by the paramount ſovereigns of Aſia on their favourites and feudatory princes. A ſimple viceroy might poſſibly have called himſelf the *Great King*, or the *Lord of all Aſia*; or he might have been ſo dignified by the Grecians: but titles, we all know, do not always carry with them actual poſſeſſion. No prince indeed that ever lived could, at any time, be ſtiled, without an hyperbole, *Lord of all Aſia*. Such titles are in fact mere Eaſtern figures: and we find often ſimilar expreſſions, where it is evident they can by no means be taken in their literal extent, "Thus ſaith "Cyrus, king of Perſia, the Lord God of "Heaven hath given me *all the kingdoms of "the earth*, Ezra, ch. i. 2."—"For I never "hurt any that was willing to ſerve Nabu-"chodonoſor, the *king of all the earth*." Judith, ch. xi. 1.

In reſpect to the *Expedition of Xerxes*, excluſive of the intrinſic difficulties which we find in the Grecian accounts, I muſt ſtill be permitted to conſider the total ſilence of Eaſtern authors, upon an event of ſuch mag-

nitude, as a circumſtance of ſome wonder. Silence, alone, I am ſenſible can never diſprove a fact: but it may ſurely furniſh matter of doubt. Did an intelligent foreigner read, in our hiſtory, the battles of Creſcy, of Poictiers, and of Agincourt, or the Deſtruction of the Spaniſh Armada; which, on turning to the Annals of France and Spain, he found nothing to corroborate: it would hardly be thought, I believe, any impeachment of his judgment, ſhould he either entertain a ſuſpicion of the whole, or ſuppoſe, that much of their importance had ariſen from the embelliſhment of our hiſtorians.

THAT the Perſians had been early in the practice of keeping records, and entering in them, with minuteneſs and regularity, a variety of circumſtances, not ſo intereſting to their empire as the invaſion of Xerxes, we are ſufficiently informed in the Sacred Writings. Is it eaſily to be conceived then, that an expedition ſhould have been wholly unnoticed, which muſt have ſtrained every ſinew of the ſtate; in which two kings are deſcribed as ſo anxiouſly intereſted; which was many years in preparation; and in the courſe of which hundreds of royal edicts muſt unavoidably have been iſſued and recorded? I think it is not. And upon this, as well as on many

other grounds, I remain ſtill in doubt, whether any ſuch expedition was ever undertaken by the *Paramount ſovereign of Perſia.* Diſguiſed in name, by ſome Greek corruption, Xerxes may poſſibly have been a feudatory prince or viceroy of the Weſtern diſtricts: and that an invaſion of Greece may have actually taken place, under this prince; I ſhall readily believe: but upon a ſcale, I muſt alſo believe, infinitely narrower than the leaſt exaggerated deſcription of the Greek hiſtorians.*

In theſe indeed the truth is ſo remarkably blended with fiction, that we can no where draw the line; nor determine, upon any rational principles, what we ſhould believe, and what we ſhould reject. In Herodotus, as before obſerved, the reputed followers of Xerxes amount to 5,283,220. Iſocrates, in his *Panathenaicos*, eſtimates the land army in round numbers at 5,000,000. And with them Plutarch, in general, agrees. But ſuch myriads appeared to Diodorus, Pliny, Ælian, and other later writers, ſo much ſtretched beyond all belief, that they at once cut off about four fifths, to bring them within the line of poſſibility. Yet what is this, but a ſingular and very unauthorized liberty in one of the moſt conſequential points of the expedition? What circumſtance in the whole

nårration is more explicit in Herodotus; or, by its frequent repetition in detail, not in figures but in words at length, ſeems leſs liable to the miſtakes of copiers? If one claſs of hiſtorians think it neceſſary then to differ ſo widely from their authority in ſo very eſſential a point, upon what principles are we to give credit to other facts, which they adopt, without producing any corroborating evidence to render them more authentic?

YET, like all who have not truth for their ground-work, even theſe writers cannot avoid contradiction in their own narratives. Diodorus, for example, makes the Aſiatic army of Xerxes 800,000; and the European auxiliaries 200,000; in all *one million*. But, in a few pages, he gives us the Inſcription ſaid to have been cut on the monument at Thermopylæ; where, like Falſtaff's men in buckram, *one million* riſes at once to *two*. And here again, he diſagrees with Herodotus, who, from the ſame monument, makes the number that fought againſt Leonidas no fewer than *three millions* *. A monument, we may alſo

* Diodorus, at the ſame time, has preſerved no conſiſtency in the proportion, which his main army bears to that of the old hiſtorian: for, inſtead of *two millions*, in the ratio of one to five, there ſhould hardly have been 600,000.

obſerve is, in general, conſidered as a record of ſome authenticity: but if this had not been much ſuſpected, Diodorus, whatever liberties he might be diſpoſed to take with Herodotus, would hardly have ventured to have altered it. Such diſcordant authorities indeed, did not the numbers themſelves exceed all credibility, ſpeak little in favour of the inſcription: and lead us to conclude, that the ſame miſinformation, policy, or hyperbole, which influenced Herodotus and Iſocrates, might have alſo influenced thoſe who erected the monument. To flatter the prowefs, to elevate the ſpirits, and to ſwell the importance of a nation, even by fiction, has been often thought the part of a good citizen. And to ſuch motives, I believe, we may ſafely attribute every circumſtance of exaggerated deſcription in the detail of this famous invaſion.*

I. SHALL not here enlarge upon the bridge over the Helleſpont, which there is reaſon to believe never exiſted but in the imagination: but ſhall only obſerve, that a bridge of boats, two miles in length, over a ſtreight of the ſea; where the current, when the wind blows from the north, ruſhes with a rapidity which no veſſel can reſiſt; ſeems not only to be unſupported, but contradicted by the experience of mankind in all ages and countries. Neither ſhall I make many remarks

on the cutting of Mount Athos. This celebrated promontory on the coaſt of Macedonia, is not, by ſea, much above two hundred miles from Athens: and we are told, that Xerxes, for three years before he croſſed the Helleſpont, had employed a number of men in ſeparating it from the continent, in order to make a canal for his ſhipping. We are likewiſe told, that Themiſtocles had, even from the battle of Marathon, been inceſſantly alarming the Athenians with another Perſian invaſion. But do we ever hear of his ſupporting his opinion by the moſt diſtant hint of this canal; the very digging of which muſt have filled all Greece with aſtoniſhment, and been the ſubject of every public converſation? Numbers of his fellow citizens, we are likewiſe informed, gave no credit to his predictions. But could they have been one moment in doubt, whilſt chains were profeſſedly forging for them, even in their hearing? Themiſtocles, it is ſaid, prevailed on the Athenians to add a hundred gallies to their fleet. But do we hear even of a propoſal, during the whole three years, to ſurprize the Perſian ſquadron, or to cut off this detachment, before they could be ſupported by the grand army? Is there any thing here conſiſtent with the character of Greek? Where is that valour, vigilance, and enter-

prize, for which they have been so celebrated? Could they, could any men indeed, have been so completely stupid, as to lie thus supinely inattentive, without a single effort, till ruin was at the threshold, and nothing but a miracle could save them? Upon general principles I hold it to be absolutely incredible. [w]

I SHALL conclude my observations on this head, with a few remarks touching the expence; upon which however I build little. But I only wish, as Herodotus even here seems inconsistent, to see it judiciously accounted for by any gentleman, who may adopt his relation; in respect to those prodigious works, and the numbers engaged in the enterprize. I have not met with the exact pay of a Persian soldier in old times: but the Greeks tell us, that they served for nothing, till the age of twenty: after which, they received pay from the public treasuries of the different provinces. We are not, I think, to suppose the Persians, at the era of this invasion, to have been poorer than the Greeks; whose foot soldiers, at different periods, received two, three, and four oboli a day. It may also be here in general remarked, that the pay of the Asiatic soldiery, in all ages, where rich plunder was not in view, has for the most part been higher than that of European armies. But

let us go upon the moſt moderate line of calculation; and take the loweſt pay of the Grecian foot ſoldier, as the ſtandard for the army of Xerxes. This, at two-pence a day for 5,283,220, would exceed ſixteen millions per annum.* Now the extra-contingencies of any campaign will be found, I believe, in all times to exceed the pay of the troops. And when we conſider the immenſe fleet, on board of which were about 600,000 men: the ſubſidies and additional pay to the mercenaries from Carthage, Gaul, Spain, Italy; all employed againſt a country where no plunder was to be expected: and if to this we ſhall add the enormous expence of a luxurious Aſiatic court, the calculation muſt be eſteemed low, if we only double the pay, and make the whole annual charge thirty-two millions. But Herodotus, who has particularly enumerated the articles of revenue at which the provinces of Perſia had been taxed by Darius Hyſtaſpes, a few years before this expedition, makes the

* A poor man, according to the orator Lyſias, was allowed an obolus (or penny) a day from the public treaſury of Athens: and 6000 pence was conſidered as ſufficient for the maintenance of five perſons during a year. If each follower of Xerxes then conſumed as much as a common Athenian, inſtead of ſixteen millions, it would be above twenty-ſix; which is in favour of my calculation.

whole amount to no more than 14,560 Euboic talents; which (at 193 l. 15 s. per talent) is only 2,821,000 l. Some ſmaller ſums are indeed hinted at, as not conſiderable enough to be particularly ſpecified: but ſuppoſe the whole to be 3,000,000 l. and it will fall ſhort of one tenth of the expence. Darius, it may alſo be obſerved, who, according to Herodotus, firſt eſtabliſhed a fixed revenue, was almoſt conſtantly engaged in wars; and thoſe of the moſt draining kind: either againſt revolted ſubjects, as the Babylonians, Egyptians, Ionians: or againſt the Scythians and Greeks, by whom he was repulſed. India is the only exception: the tribute from which (4680 talents) is included in the above liſt. In ſuch circumſtances, he cannot be ſuppoſed to have hoarded much. Xerxes could of courſe ſucceed to no great ſuperfluity of treaſure: and in the beginning of his reign, we are told, he was under the neceſſity of quelling the Egyptian revolt; which could not be accompliſhed without conſiderable expence. Whatever ideas may be formed, at the ſame time, of Aſiatic deſpotiſm, we may obſerve, that the moſt arbitrary tyrant cannot, in any age, much exceed bounds in the raiſing of extraordinary ſupplies. A people can bear oppreſſion only to a certain degree: and depopulation or re-

bellion muſt ſoon convince him of his error. The great ſources of riches, trade, manufacture, and agriculture, in any improved ſtate, were to be found in few of the provinces: and the various reſources of modern times were then utterly unknown. But, to give every latitude to the argument, let us ſuppoſe, on this occaſion, a fourfold proportion of money, proviſions and other articles to have been exacted; an increaſe of taxation which no country in the world perhaps could ever ſuddenly bear: yet even this will but little exceed the third part of the loweſt poſſible eſtimate. When we conſider then the number of years, which this expedition, in preparation and execution, is ſaid to have employed; and the enormous ſums to which the whole muſt have amounted; Herodotus and his followers cannot be conſiſtent. Either his minute ſtate of the revenue of Perſia muſt be fictitious; or the Invaſion, upon the enlarged line, muſt, even on this ground, be impoſſible. [1]

But, did any further arguments appear neceſſary to confute theſe exaggerated numbers, the contraſting of them with the comparative ſmallneſs of the Perſian armies, which oppoſed Alexander, would alone be ſufficient. It was not *then* an expedition againſt a ſmall territory. The object was the preſervation of

the downfal of the Perſian empire. Darius was a prince in every reſpect ſuperior to any deſcription we have of Xerxes. His empire was larger, more firmly eſtabliſhed, more flouriſhing; and his riches, if we credit Juſtin, incomparably greater. When all was at ſtake may we not then believe that every exertion was made? Yet although the deſign of the preparations of Philip and Alexander had been long known in Perſia, the army at the paſſage of the Granicus hardly exceeded 100,000 men. At Iſſus, where Darius commanded in perſon, the accounts vary from four to ſix hundred thouſand. And, at the great and deciſive battle of Arbela, after the king had ſtrained every nerve, whilſt Alexander was employed in the ſiege of Tyre and in the reduction of Egypt, the moſt exaggerated eſtimates make his army only about a million; whilſt the more authentic details do not make it half that number. [y]

To ſum up all; the expedition of Xerxes, upon the moſt moderate ſcale of the Greek writers, ſeems to be inconſiſtent with probability and the ordinary powers of man. It is all upon ſtilts. Every ſtep we take is upon romantic ground. And nothing indeed ſeems wanting, but a few Genies, to make it, in every reſpect, an exceeding good Arabian Tale. [z]

DISSERTATION

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY · MONDAY 3 ... ...

I HAVE obſerved, that till the reign of Philip of Macedon, the Perſian hiſtorians have hardly mentioned the Grecians but in the light of tributaries to the Perſian empire: and, if we pay a little attention to the Grecians themſelves, we ſhall have little reaſon, I preſume, to think that this idea was adopted without ſome foundation. For, that every ſtate almoſt, European and Aſiatic, without excepting even Athens and Sparta, were, at different times, and in different degrees, under the control of the Perſian kings, will not with juſtice be diſputed, by any man who has read with attention the hiſtorians of Greece. [a]

THE Perſians, like every aſpiring overgrown ſtate, early aimed at univerſal empire: and, in the purſuit of this pernicious phantom, ſo flattering to the pride of abſolute monarchs as well as of republics, it is not the courage, nor is it the poverty, of any particular people, that can put them in ſafety againſt the efforts of over-ruling ambition. [b]

THE Gauls, the Germans, the Britons, were unqueſtionably very brave and very poor: yet the Romans thought them objects of ſufficient conſequence, to employ againſt them, for many years, their greateſt generals: to fight numberleſs battles with various ſucceſs: to deſtroy above a million of men: and all, to

get poſſeſſion of countries, the very deſcription of which ſeems to freeze their authors as they write.

The Scythians, the Greeks, and other ancient nations, appear to have been ſimilar objects of ambition to the Perſians. With many they were ſucceſsful. By the Scythians they were repulſed. And, in reſpect to the Greeks, nothing for a long time appears to have been deciſive. The Ionians, the Æolians, the Dorians, we are however informed, were ſubjected by Cyrus, after the defeat of Crœſus. In the revenue roll of Darius Hyſtaſpes, we ſee them accordingly, with other neighbouring ſtates, rated at 400 talents: and, with ſome intervals of revolt, they continued to be tributary to the Perſians, till the time of Alexander. Indeed, their general conduct, upon various occaſions, proves them, as well as others, to have been, to every great purpoſe, ſubjects of the empire. In the fleet of Xerxes, as enumerated by Herodotus and Diodorus, we have not only Ionians, Æolians, and Dorians, but Rhodians, Samians, Mileſians, Leſbians, Chians, Theſſalians, Acheans; and indeed ſquadrons from almoſt every ſeaport and iſland comprehended between the Helleſpont and the promontories of Sunium in Attica, and Triopus on the Carian coaſt: whilſt his land army,

on his arrival in Europe, was, according to Lysias and other writers, reinforced by every Grecian state; Athens, Sparta, Thespia, and Platæa excepted. [d]

WHAT conclusions can be drawn from such undoubted facts? Have such states the appearance of independence? That there were frequent struggles against the Persian power, headed by the Athenians and Lacedæmonians, cannot be doubted: but it seems to be equally undoubted, that on the appearance of the Persian armies, those republics, who, either from fear or choice, continued in obedience, immediately, like Phrygians, Syrians, and other subjects of the empire, joined the royal standard; and fought, without compulsion or reluctance, against their countrymen. [e]

THE invasion of Xerxes, it must be here observed, was not a sudden attack, where one state might have been subdued before the others could have marched to their assistance: for, whilst the famous canal of Athos and the equally famous bridge over the Hellespont were a-making, Xerxes, as the Greeks tell us, was full three years, on the coasts of Asia Minor, in open preparation for the subjugation of Greece. Here was evidently time sufficient, whilst the storm was impending, to have healed all animosities, which peace and rivalship

might have created; to have united every *independent* ſtate in one compact body; and to have made every kind of exertion for repelling the common foe. But that the Perſian was conſidered, as ſuch, by *all* the republics of Greece, does by no means appear on the face of hiſtory. Many of them ſeem, on the contrary, to have been far more afraid of the arbitrary tyranny of Athens and Sparta: and apparently, with much more reaſon. For the moſt unfeeling deſpotiſm on record carries with it an air of mildneſs, when compared to the barbarous rapacity with which the Athenians and Spartans oppreſſed their colonies and ſubordinate ſtates. We accordingly, on this occaſion, read of no compulſion. The Aſiatic, European, and Inſular ſquadrons of Greek ſhipping join Xerxes on his firſt movement, three years before he ſets foot on European ground; and before he could be in a ſituation to overawe them: whilſt, had all the Aſiatic Greeks, on the contrary, like independent men, betaken themſelves to their ſhipping, and joined the Iſland and European fleets; they might have deſtroyed, or at leaſt ſo weakened the Perſian maritime force, as to have rendered the invaſion abortive. [f]

CAN any chain of acknowledged facts imply a clearer dependence of the Greeks; whether

it originated from the ſword, from corruption, from jealouſy, or from all together? Nothing but the poſitive proof which their own hiſtories afford us, when they come down to more authentic times. For, from the peace of Antalcidas, in the year 387 before Chriſt, till the Macedonian conqueſt, there is hardly an hiſtorical fact leſs liable to ſuſpicion. The Aſiatic Greeks and many of the iſlands are, in that diſgraceful treaty, formally acknowledged as ſubjects of the Perſian king: their citadels are garriſoned by Perſian troops: and an actual tribute is continued to be levied, as an old and undoubted right. Even Athens and Sparta appear to have enjoyed, during this period, only the mere ſhadow of freedom: a ſhadow, ſomewhat ſimilar to that with which they were afterwards flattered, when part of the Roman empire: and they ſeem indeed to have been, to every eſſential end, as effectually ſubmiſſive to the *Great King*, as any province of his dominions. Can any evidence, upon this head, be more pointed and explicit than the ſpeeches of their greateſt orators on the abject ſlavery of their condition? "At preſent," ſays Iſocrates (in his Panegyric of Athens) "the king of Perſia takes the lead in all our affairs, commands us to purſue

"that conduct which is most agreeable to his
"interest; and, except that he does not send
"his nobles to be our governors, what is
"wanting to complete his authority? Is he
"not the arbiter of war and peace? Are not
"all our measures subject to his controul?
"Do we not run to him with our accusa-
"tions against one another, as to our um-
"pire and lord? and we call him the *Great*
"*King*, as if we were his slaves." [g]

Can more be necessary? And what corollary must we draw from the whole? That the Asiatic Greeks were subject and tributary to Persia, there does not remain, in my apprehension, the least doubt. And that the European states, if not positively furnishing a revenue, were in a state of dependence almost as humiliating, seems to be equally clear. Do we not find the Persian monarch prescribing their rule of conduct? Do we not find their soldiers in all his armies? * Do we not find their chiefs resorting to his court with solici-

* The Greek cities of Asia Minor, particularly Miletus and Halicarnassus, (the birth-place of Herodotus) were most obstinately defended against Alexander, by Memnon a Grecian: and he was opposed by Greeks in every battle he fought with Darius; no fewer than 12,000 of them falling at the battle of Issus.

tations and mutual complaints? What ſtronger marks of ſubjection, the form of Satrap government excepted, do we diſcover among the Egyptians, the Syrians, the Medes? And what ſituation of one country, with relation to another, could more fully juſtify writers who, from ſuch ſtrong appearances, ſhould declare the one to be ſubject or tributary to the other? Hiſtorians, when ſpeaking generally, are not expected to deſcend to minute exceptions. That ſome of the Grecian ſtates never were tributary to Perſia, in a literal ſenſe, I ſhall readily admit: but that there were enough, in the eye eſpecially of a foreign writer, to involve the ſmaller in the greater number, ſeems to be a very unqueſtionable hiſtorical fact. Nothing indeed is more common than ſuch general modes of expreſſion. Alexander is ſaid to have conquered India, when he confeſſedly never ſaw the Ganges. And the Romans thought there was no impropriety in calling Britain a province of the empire, though a great part of it remained inimical and independent. [h]

Before I conclude this head, I ſhall beg leave to offer a few obſervations on ſome animadverſions which Mr. Bryant has thought

proper to make on this ſubject †. It is im-

† "You favour the Perſian hiſtorians; and perhaps very juſtly. Yet I ſometimes have apprehended, that you may hurt your own cauſe by the principles upon which you try to eſtabliſh it. For when you contraſt the Perſian writers with thoſe of Greece, you ſeem to found their merit on mere negatives; which ſome may look upon as capital deficiencies. You accordingly tell us, p. 42. 3. that there is no mention made of Cyrus the Great; nor of Crœſus: nor of the kingdom of Lydia being annexed to that of Perſia. There is moreover no account of Smerdis Magnus; nor of Darius the ſon of Hyſtaſpes: nor does the name of Cyrus the Younger occur in the catalogue, which you give. Conſequently the expedition under Clearchus, and the return of the ten thouſand under Xenophon, are not to be found. *Not a veſtige*, ſay you, *is to be diſcovered of the famous battles of Marathon, Thermopylæ, Salamis, Platæa, or Mycale:* all which, I fear, will not make in favour of your hiſtorians. As they are therefore ſilent about ſo many events, pray, what information is there, for which we may be beholden to them? Why, they tell us, you ſay, p. 45. that the Grecians, ſo far from having had any advantages over the Perſians, were in reality tributaries to them; and their ſtates under contribution: p. 45. That Philip of Macedon was likewiſe dependant upon the ſame people: that he had been defeated in Macedonia by Darius; and paid annually *a thouſand golden eggs*, p. 49. Laſtly, what is very extraordinary, and little thought of, that Alexander the Great was a Perſian, the ſon of Darius Codomannus: the ſame prince, whom he defeated, and ſucceeded. ibid." See *Mr. Bryant's Apology*

possible to call them arguments: these he has not thought necessary. I wish he had thought it equally unnecessary to misrepresent my meaning and to misquote my words: or, (as he himself observes, in respect to the Dutch reviewers) "to invent matter of accusation, where the writer himself is guiltless." Amongst other points which I shall pass unnoticed, I must beg to know where I have said, that the Greeks had *no* advantages over the Grecians? where I have called Alexander a *Persian?* and where he is said to be the *son* of Darius Codomannus? I have doubted, and I think with reason, the *magnitude* of the Persian invasions, and of the Grecian victories: but where have I denied the events themselves? I have said that Alexander, for whom the Persians have a high respect, was supposed by them to be the son of Darab I. by a daughter of Philip; but to have been *born in Macedon*: Does this constitute him a *Persian?* *

to the Author of this Dissertation, p. 93.——I shall have occasion to mention more particularly this (privately circulated) *Apology* in the course of the following sheets.

* The Asiatics, on the contrary, so far from calling him a *Persian*, stile him, in general, *Eskander Younani*, *Alexander the Ionian* or the *Greek*; to distinguish him from another famous *Eskander*; whom they suppose to have been a very ancient king of Persia.

I have ſaid too that Alexander was conſidered as the *brother by half blood* to Darab II. (Darius Codomannus): does that make him his *ſon?* [1]

I MUST likewiſe beg of the learned gentleman to inform me, from what words of mine he can draw his concluſions in reſpect to *Cyrus the Younger*, and the *expedition of Clearchus?* Or where I have, in the moſt remote manner, even hinted a diſbelief of that part of hiſtory? What right, let me alſo aſk, could this prince have, either in Weſtern or Eaſtern hiſtorians, to a place in the catalogue of Perſian kings? Did he ever reign? Do we generally place among the ſovereigns of any ſtate unſucceſsful competitors for the throne? Do we rank the Duke of Monmouth among the kings of England? How can we reaſonably expect, at the ſame time, to find in Oriental writers the *return of the ten thouſand Greeks?* Illuſtrious as this retreat was, it is to accident alone that we are indebted for it, in any conſpicuous light. Had not ſuch a writer as Xenophon been actively concerned in the circumſtances which he relates, it might have been but barely known, and unintereſtingly recorded: like many a noble atchievement, which in all ages, from inattention or inability to commemorate them, have been either loſt, or very

imperfectly told. This famous expedition was certainly of high importance to the men engaged in it. It was glorious to the name of Greek. But could it ſtand in any ſuch light of conſequence to the Perſians? It might be ſufficient for their writers ſimply to mention, that a rebellion had broke out; that it had made a progreſs; and that it was cruſhed: without judging it in the leaſt neceſſary, to trace the ſcattered remains of the defeated army thro' all the difficulties of a route they did not know: or to relate adventures, which could never apparently reach their ear.[k]

BUT indeed the ſilence of the Perſian hiſtorians, with regard to ſuch an event, could never, in my opinion, injure it in the leaſt: any more than their ſilence on the internal wars and politics of Greece would affect Thucydides or the great Athenian orators. Details ſo minute, ſo accurate, and ſo apparently authentic, ſtand not in need of collateral ſupport: and muſt even ſo far affect the authority of contradictory writers, that, on this ground, I coincide entirely with Mr. Hume; "Diodorus Siculus is a good writer: but it is "with pain I ſee his narration contradict, in "ſo many particulars, the two moſt authen- "tic pieces of all Greek hiſtory, viz. Xeno-

"phon's expedition, and Demoſthenes's ora-
"tions."[1]

UPON the whole, I beg leave to repeat, that I entertain no undue partiality for Eaſtern writers: nor will I, in many reſpects, lift them to a level with the Greeks. Their manner is different, and leſs adapted to an European taſte. They have their prejudices too, as well as the Greeks; but we cannot ſo eaſily make an allowance for the one, as we have been accuſtomed to make for the other. It is to matters of fact, however, that I chiefly point. On this ground I have endeavoured to ſhew, that the Greeks are not always to be truſted. Some of their beſt friends, I have alſo ſhewn, think they are hardly to be truſted at all. Though the Aſiatics therefore may have ſome failings, they may have likewiſe ſome merits; and that they *might*, in judicious hands, amend our received hiſtory of Eaſtern countries, is not, I hope, too bold a thought. I have already obſerved, that the chief Perſian hiſtorians are ſubſequent to the Mohammedan era: but I have alſo obſerved, that they drew their materials from much older writers. Thoſe writers, it is true, are not at preſent known: but that is no argument, why they may not, in time, be found. M. D'Herbelot obſerves, that a collection of

ancient Persian hiſtorians had been long ago tranſlated into Arabic by Ebn Mocanna. Could even this tranſlation be recovered, ſome judgment might poſſibly be formed of the authenticity of thoſe we already have. But this muſt be a diſtant object. Eaſtern ſtudies have but few admirers. And, indeed, till the Great and the Learned, as bodies or as individuals, ſhall be more forward in their encouragement of ſuch diſcoveries, thoſe who may beſtow much attention upon them, may boaſt perhaps more zeal than diſcretion; and poſſibly may write what very few will read.[a]

SECT. II.

Of the Importance of women in the Eaſt. Their ſtation in ſociety not juſtly underſtood by European travellers. They enjoy in many parts privileges ſimilar to thoſe of Europe. The riſe and progreſs of the Mohammedan religion connected perhaps with thoſe privileges. Inſtances of the influence of women in public affairs. Marriage ſettlements. Divorces. Nuptial ceremonies. Singular modes of marriage. Dreſs of Eaſtern women. Many European faſhions of great antiquity in the Eaſt.

TRAVELLERS, in general, do not appear to have conceived a juſt idea of the ſituation of Women in many Eaſtern countries. They are, for the moſt part, conſidered by them as of ſmall conſequence in the ſtate: they are repreſented as mere ſlaves to the paſſions of the ſtronger ſex: and, becauſe the great men keep many beautiful Circaſſians locked up from public view, a proper diſtinction does not ſeem always to have been

made between them and free born women. But an attention to the languages and customs of Asia, will give us reason to believe, that such indiscriminate observations are partial, superficial, and inconclusive. I have already (p. 198, &c.) thrown out some ideas on this subject; and shall here offer a few more facts, which appear to strengthen my opinion. [a]

In Arabia, very early, we find the women in high consideration; and possessing privileges hardly inferior to those which they enjoy in the most enlightened countries of Europe. They had a right, by the laws, to the enjoyment of independent property, by inheritance, by gift, by marriage settlement, or by any other mode of acquisition. The wife had a regular dower, which she was to enjoy in full right after the demise of her husband: and she had also a kind of pin-money, or paraphernalia, which she might dispose of in her life-time, or bequeath at her death, without his knowledge or consent. [b]

To this consideration and weight, which property, by the laws and customs of the Arabians, gave to the female sex, it may even perhaps be no extravagant stretch of thought, to trace the success, if not the origin, of a religion; which, from the extensiveness of its operations, may be considered as one of the

greateſt events in the hiſtory of mankind, Poverty, as Cardinal de Retz juſtly obſerves, is the grave of many a great deſign. And ſo low in circumſtances was Mohammed, in the early part of life, that had it not been for the weight and power which he derived from his marriage with a rich widow, his enthuſiaſm might, perhaps, have juſt exiſted and expired with himſelf. His father Abdallah was a younger ſon of Abdolmotalleb, chief of the Koreiſh tribe; but, dying young, he left Mohammed and his mother, for all their eſtate, only five camels and an Ethiopian ſlave. When he arrived at man's eſtate, his fortune was, of conſequence, ſo humble, that he was recommended by his uncle as factor to the widow Khadijah; who carried on an extenſive trade with Syria and other countries. This lady was of a noble family, and of the ſame tribe. She had been twice married: ſhe had been largely left by both huſbands: and had improved the whole by commerce. Her young factor was eſteemed the handſomeſt man of his age: his genius was quick: and his addreſs inſinuating. She made him her third huſband; and, with her hand, ſhe gave him the diſpoſal of her fortune. Being a man of birth, this raiſed him at once, from a menial ſtation, to a level with the firſt no-

bles of Arabia; and gave him consequence, independence, and leisure, sufficient to prepare the plans for his future greatness. It was fifteen years after this marriage before he publicly assumed the prophetic character: and he then met with such vigorous opposition, particularly from the leading men of his own tribe, that, nearly crushed as he often was, he must probably have been quite overwhelmed; had not his riches, by increasing his power, his importance, and his proselytes, furnished him with resources to overcome difficulties; which might otherwise have baffled all the vigour of his genius *.

THE Prophet, at his death, left many widows: four of whom, whilst they lived, had considerable weight in the councils of the Arabs. But the influence of Ayesha, whom they dignified with the title of *Mother of the Faithful*, was almost unbounded. Ali, as son-in-law and cousin-german to Mohammed, was generally considered as his successor: but he had incurred the displeasure of Ayesha, whom he had once, with many others, accused of incontinence: and she never forgave him. Her father Abubeker owed his eleva-

* Mohammed received also a large fortune with Ayesha, the daughter of Abubekre: and a still larger with the widow Hafsa, daughter of Omar.

tion to the Khalifat chiefly to her addreſs. Upon his deceaſe, ſhe ſupported Omar. She was the chief conſpirator againſt Othman, the ſucceſſor of Omar. And when Ali, at length, ſucceeded to the Khalifat, ſhe headed a formidable rebellion againſt him. She took Baſrah; and gave him battle near that place. This famous action is called *Yumu'l'jamal*, the *day of the camel*, from a large white one, upon which ſhe was mounted. She rode through the ranks; and, to animate her troops, ſhe drove into the thickeſt of the battle. Seventy hands, it is ſaid, were ſtruck off, in attempting to ſeize her bridle. And, when the legs of her camel were at length cut off, the carriage in which ſhe ſat reſembled a porcupine, from the number of javelins and arrows with which it was transfixed. The ſuperior generalſhip of Ali prevailed; her army, though more numerous, was routed; and ſhe fell into the hands of the Khalif. When brought before him, he ſaid, "What "doſt thou think of the work of God to "thee?" She anſwered, "Thou haſt con"quered, O Ali! be merciful." The generous Ali did ſhow her mercy. He ſent her to Medina, attended by ſeventy women in men's apparel *; where ſhe was ordered

* This circumſtance is mentioned in the *Tarikhu'l'maſſemin*; but no reaſon is aſſigned for ſuch an eſcort.

to confine herſelf to her houſe, and to meddle no more in ſtate affairs. On the death of Ali, however, ſhe recovered her influence: and, many years afterwards, when Moawiyah wiſhed to make the Khalifat hereditary in his family, he thought it neceſſary to ſecure her intereſt, by a preſent of bracelets valued at 150,000 dinars, near 70,000 l. [d]

The Arabian women of rank ſeem indeed to have taken a very active concern both in civil and military affairs. At the battle of Ohod, where Mohammed was defeated by the Pagan Meccans, the reſerve, we find, was led on by Henda, the wife of Abu Sofian, a man of the firſt rank.' She was accompanied by fifteen other women of diſtinction; who, with muſic and exhortations, animated the troops. By their ſpirit and reproaches they were repeatedly rallied, when retiring before Mohammed: and by them, in a great meaſure, was the fortune of the day decided. [e]

One of the moſt conſiderable of the prophet's oppoſers, was a lady called Forka; who ſeems to have anſwered exactly the deſcription of a feudal peereſs in the middle ages of Europe. She was poſſeſſed of territory, of a caſtle, and of great riches and conſideration. Her troops had checked the inroads of the Prophet's marauding parties;

and Zeid, one of his chief generals, was ſent to reduce her to obedience. The defence of her caſtle was obſtinate: but it was at length taken by ſtorm: and the lady, with part of her garriſon, were killed. Amongſt other captives was Forka's young daughter and heireſs; who, with all her wealth, became the prize of the conqueror. [f] *

MANY other examples might be given; but it may be ſufficient, for the preſent ſubject, to obſerve in general, that the dignified behaviour, which diſtinguiſhed the Arabian women, long before and after Mohammed, points clearly to a conſciouſneſs of their own importance: to which an habitual ſlavery and ſubjection could never poſſibly have given birth. [g]

NUMBERLESS inſtances of the conſequence of women might be brought alſo from Perſia, Tartary, and other Eaſtern countries. But I muſt again beg the reader to remember, that the limits of theſe ſketches will not permit me to enter into details; or to preſent to his attention any thing but mere outlines. It is certain, among other privileges, that they poſſeſſed the right of ſucceſſion to the throne; and often acted as regents during the minority of their ſons. Touran dokht and Azurmi dokht, the daughters of Khoſrou

Parviz, were successively the reigning queens of Persia, a few years before the Mohammedan conquest.—About the beginning of the tenth century, queen Seidet was regent, during the non-age of her son, and governed with much wisdom. When he took the reins of government, he appointed the famous physician Avicenna* to be his vizir. But, public affairs being managed with much imprudence, the queen mother, finding herself treated with indignity, retired from court; and, raising an army, defeated her son: whom, nevertheless, she restored to the throne; and assisted, from that time, with her councils. The kingdom flourished whilst she lived: but, on her death, the powerful Sultan Mahmoud of Ghezna, who had ever treated her with much respect, attacked her dissipated son, and annexed Persia to his empire.[s]

According to Abulgazi Khan, by the ancient laws of the Moguls, a prince could not reign till he was thirty years of age: on which occasions, the Queen mother acted always as regent. He gives an instance, in this place, of a princess, named Alanca, (from whom Jengiz Khan derived descent) who governed her people, for many years, during the minority of her son. Turkhan Khatun, a Tartar lady, mother of Mohammed, Sultan

of Kharezmé, was a princeſs of uncommon abilities, and had ſuch an aſcendancy over her ſon, that ſhe, in a great meaſure, governed the kingdom; which, before the invaſion of Jengiz Khan, was conſidered as the moſt powerful in the Eaſt: and the court the moſt magnificent and polite. Yet ladies of the firſt diſtinction thought it not inconſiſtent with the delicacy of their ſex to take the field againſt the Moguls. They made alſo many ſallies during the ſiege of the capital; which held out, near twelve months, againſt a prodigious army commanded by three of Jenghiz Khan's ſons. And, when it was taken at laſt by aſſault, the inhabitants, male and female, retired, fighting, from houſe to houſe, and from ſtreet to ſtreet; till, according to the loweſt computation, above a hundred thouſand were killed. The ſpirit indeed of the Kharezmian women, has induced ſome writers to conſider them as the deſcendants of the ancient Amazons.[h]

THE Vizir Nezam gives many inſtances of the political influence of the Women in Eaſtern courts; and is at infinite pains to adviſe his ſon to pay to them the higheſt attention. He divides the court into four claſſes, at the head of which he places the Women; and obſerves, that much of his ſucceſs will depend upon the manner in which he conducts

himſelf towards them. The firſt claſs that claims your notice, ſays he, are the Principal Women: the next, the King's Sons: after them, the Great Omras: and, laſt of all, the Inferior Miniſters.—Altun Taſh, continues the Vizir, was the firſt Omra of the Divan, in the reign of Sultan Mahmoud of Ghezna. When the government of Kharezmé being vacant, he ſolicited the appointment. As he was eſteemed the chief pillar of the throne, the court was ſurprized, that he ſhould have accepted it. And a friend begging of him to know, what could induce him to reſign the power he had over ſo vaſt an empire, to take the charge of a corner: Altun Taſh replied, "By the God who created heaven and earth, "the ſecret which I ſhall now diſcloſe to "you I have not revealed to any living ſoul. "It was the enmity of Jemila Kandahari, "and that only, which made me give up the "power I had over this great empire. For, "many years have the affairs thereof been "under my management: and, in that "time, whatever I tied ſhe unlooſed; and "whatever I unlooſed ſhe tied. What ſhe "reſolved upon I was incapable of oppoſing; "and whatever ſhe oppoſed it was in vain "for me to attempt. Vexed with being con-"tinually foiled, and unable to apply a re-

"medy, the world appeared dark in my "eyes; and I voluntarily threw myſelf into "this retirement, where I truſt in God I "ſhall be ſafe from the effects of her reſent-"ment." We muſt not ſuppoſe, that this female influence was thus powerful in the court of a weak or a diſſipated prince: for Mahmoud was one of the greateſt monarchs that ever reigned: almoſt the whole of his great empire he had conquered himſelf; and it was governed intirely under his own inſpection. Jemila Kandahari, whom I have already mentioned (p. 207.) appears to have been the firſt lady of the bed-chamber to Mahmoud's Sultana: and her reſentment againſt Altun Taſh, was owing to his oppoſition to the Vizir Ahmed Haſſan, whom ſhe patronized. Gallantry, at the ſame time, does not appear to have had any concern in her operations: for Nezam obſerves, that, though her favourite Ahmed correſponded with her often, they did not ſee one another perhaps once in twelve months.[1]

Marriage ſettlements and portions given with daughters, or ſiſters, appear to be of great antiquity in Arabia: for, long before Mohammed, they had refined ſo much upon them, that it became common, where two

men were obliged to give great fortunes with their female relations, to evade payment, by making a double marriage: one espousing the daughter or sister of the other; and giving his daughter or sister in return. This practice, which they called *Shigar*, probably with the view of encouraging alliances among different tribes, or preventing too much wealth from accumulating in particular families, Mohammed declared to be illegal in the Alcoran. —The separate property, or paraphernalia, which the wife enjoyed, seems to have been the produce of such presents as the bride received from her friends, or from her future husband, before marriage. Those of the bridegroom, which were called *Nukl*, had no fixed medium; being proportioned to his affection, to his fortune, and often to his ostentation: for it was customary to send those presents, a day or two before the nuptials, with great pomp, from his house to the dwelling of the bride. And although the whole might have been carried, perhaps with ease, by one or two camels, horses, or servants, they would frequently make a procession of ten, twenty, thirty, or more: every one bearing something, set off with ornaments, in a gay shewy manner.*

THEIR marriage ceremonies, in the East,

ſeem indeed to have been, in all times, attended with much feſtivity and public parade. All the friends of both families aſſembled: and, where the fortune or the vanity of the bridegroom, or of the father of the bride, were conſiderable, they were in general very expenſive. The nuptials of perſons of high rank, were aſtoniſhingly ſplendid. The marriage of the Khalif Almamoun with the daughter of Haſſan Sahal, governor of Babylonian Irak, was attended with almoſt incredible expence. Slaves of both ſexes, with other rich preſents, were ſent by the governor to every grandee. He defrayed the expence of the whole court and of the Khalif's guards, during that prince's reſidence at Fommalſaleh, where Haſſan Sahal generally lived. The roads from thence to Baghdad, for near a hundred miles, were covered with mats of gold and ſilver ſtuff: and the bride's head-dreſs was adorned with a thouſand pearls; each, (if there is no miſtake or exaggeration) of the ſize of a pigeon's egg or of a large nut: which the Khalif immediately ſettled on her, as part of her dower. [i]

Even upon ordinary occaſions it was uſual to throw amongſt the populace, as the proceſſion moved along, money, ſweetmeats, flowers, and other articles; which the people

catched in cloths, made for ſuch occaſions, ſtretched in a particular manner upon frames. With regard to the money, however, there appears often to have been a mixture of œconomy or rather of deception; which probably aroſe from the neceſſity of complying with a cuſtom, that might be ill ſuited to the fortunes of ſome, and to the avarice of others: for we find, that it was not uncommon to collect bad money, called *kelb*, at a low price, to throw away at nuptial proceſſions.*

THE bride, on the day of marriage, was conducted with great ceremony by her friends to her huſband's houſe; and immediately on her arrival, ſhe made him a variety of preſents; eſpecially of houſhold furniture, with a ſpear, and a tent. There ſeems to be a curious ſimilitude, in ſome of thoſe ceremonies, to cuſtoms which prevailed amongſt the old Germans, before they left their foreſts; as well as among the Gothic nations, after they were eſtabliſhed in their conqueſts. Tacitus obſerves, that the German bridegrooms and brides made each other reciprocal preſents; and particularly of arms and cattle. The gifts made to the Eaſtern bride appear likewiſe to have been upon the ſame principles with the *Morgengabe*, or *Morning gift*, which it was common for the European huſ-

band, in the early and middle ages, to preſent to his wife the morning after marriage. And, whilſt the dower, in both, ſeems to have reverted, upon the death of the widow, to the kindred of the huſband, the preſents were left entirely at her own diſpoſal. [a]

A MAN, without the interpoſition of the law, might divorce his wife, provided he paid to her whatever dower had been ſettled by the marriage contract: unleſs he could prove, to the ſatisfaction of her aſſembled friends, that her conduct had given ſufficient cauſe for the ſeparation: in which caſe her fortune and ſettlements were forfeited. The wife had alſo the ſame power of divorce, if ſhe diſliked her huſband: but then ſhe relinquiſhed her ſettlements, and returned all the preſents ſhe had received from him before or after marriage. A man might re-marry his divorced wife, even unto the third time; beyond which it was unlawful. The form of repudiation was very conciſe: the huſband ſaying only, "Get thee gone, I care not for thee." Yet ſimple as it was, they conſidered it as ſo binding, that if a couple lived afterwards together, without the ceremony of a re-marriage, it was reckoned infamous, and viewed in the ſame light as adultery. [c]

TEMPORARY marriages are common in

many parts of the Eaſt. The Arabians call them *Almutah*. The Alcoran ſpeaks rather equivocally with regard to them; which has opened a field for much difference of opinion among the Mohammedan lawyers. About the beginning of the ninth century they were interdicted by the Khalif Almamoun: but they were never entirely diſcontinued; and are now very common. They are contracted by a written indenture, witneſſed by the Cadhi; and a certain ſum is ſettled upon the woman, to be paid to her on the expiry of the term: when the engagement may either be renewed or finally diſſolved. The offspring of ſuch connexions cannot inherit [p]

A SINGULAR matrimonial cuſtom, we may here remark, ſomewhat reſembling the above, prevailed of old in many parts of Europe. Men of rank, who had loſt their wives, but had children, to avoid burthening their eſtates, might marry low born women; who, bringing no fortune, were intitled to no dower. Theſe contracts (according to Baron von Lowhen) are ſtill prevalent in Germany; where they are ſtiled *Left handed marriages*: it being a part of the ceremony for the bridegroom to give his left hand to the bride. The children of ſuch marriages are not capa-

ble of inheriting; and bear neither the name nor arms of the father. [q]

We find in Scripture, that when a man died, leaving no iſſue by his wife, it was ſometimes incumbent upon his next unmarried brother to eſpouſe the widow. A cuſtom ſimilar to this, is not only found among the Arabians, but another ſtill more ſtrange. For where a father left one or more widows, the ſons often married them, provided they were not their own mothers. This uſage was ſuppreſſed by Mohammed: and it appears, even before his time, to have been marked with a degree of deteſtation: the word *Makt*, which denotes this ſpecies of marriage, ſignifying alſo *hatred* and *enmity*. Marrying a brother's widow, if childleſs, is ſtill cuſtomary in ſome parts of Tartary; particularly in Circaſſia. And Abulgazi Khan mentions ſeveral princes who had married their ſtep-mothers. He ſeems indeed to conſider it as a thing of courſe: and particularly tells us, that Octai Khan married one of the widows of his father Jengiz Khan. But what has moſt ſurprized me, is to find ſo odd a cuſtom prevailing even in Scotland, ſo late as the eleventh century: it being mentioned by Lord Hailes in his Annals; who ſuppoſes, that it might have originated

from avarice, in order to relieve the heir from the payment of a jointure.

An inſtitution, we are informed, was introduced or revived among the Moguls and Tartars by Jengiz Khan, which appears to have been founded on the principles of ſound political wiſdom: two families, though all their children were dead, being permitted to form a matrimonial alliance, by marrying the deceaſed ſon of one to the deceaſed daughter of the other. Theſe nuptials had often moſt ſalutary conſequences; hoſtile tribes having been united by this imaginary tie, when all other means of pacification had failed. And they ſeem even to have viewed it with more ſuperſtitious veneration than if the parties had been alive: conſidering any breach of treaty, after this ideal contract, as drawing upon themſelves the vengeance of the departed ſpirits.—The ancient Perſians, from a notion that married people were peculiarly happy in a future ſtate, uſed often to hire perſons, to be eſpouſed to ſuch of their relations as had died in celibacy.

It may not be quite foreign to the preſent ſubject, to make a few remarks upon ſome peculiarities in the dreſs of Eaſtern women; as even from thence ſome freſh lights may be

thrown upon the female character. In all countries where drefs has arrived at any degree of refinement, whatever is confidered as a beauty will generally be imitated by art; where nature has denied her bounty. To this general propenfity we may trace the origin of face-painting, patches, the bolftering of the petticoats, falfe hair, and the feathered ornaments of the head: all which we difcover very early in the Eaft. From the defcription of Jezebel, and from various other paffages in the Old Teftament, we find, that face-painting was then fafhionable among women of rank; and, from thefe words of Jeremiah, (ch. iv. 30.) "Though thou rendeft thy face "with painting, in vain fhalt thou make thy-"felf fair;" we plainly difcover, that the Jewifh women had then carried it to the vicious excefs, of even rending and disfiguring their faces, by repeated and intemperate ufe.

THE words in Arabic and Perfian, which exprefs painting in all its ftages, are very numerous. They paint their cheeks and alfo their nails with red; the reft of the face, the neck, and the arms, with white; and their eyes, in a particular manner, with black, to give them a fine luftre. Eye-painting, we find, was common in Ezekiel's time, (ch. xxiii. 40.) "Thou didft wafh thyfelf, paintedft thine

"eyes, and deckedst thyself with ornaments." The particular colours which the Women of Palestine affected, are not mentioned: but, among the Persians and Arabians, we find not only red, black, and white, but even saffron and other yellow washes for the face. Their hair they comb with great care; and they highly perfume it with odoriferous unguents or pomatums. Tire-women are much employed: and there are even females, whose only business is to clean, thin, and sharpen the teeth. *

AMONG other fashions, which may possibly have been borrowed from Asia, are ornamental patches. Black moles on the face have been long considered as a singular beauty in the East. We have only to look into the Arabian and Persian poets for innumerable instances of the enthusiasm with which they admired this fancied elegance. That the ladies would, of consequence, use every art to imitate a beauty so highly prized, is extremely natural: and hence, perhaps, arose the fashion of substituting imprinted marks, or patches of black silk, to counterfeit nature. Upon the same principles we may account for the number of words in the Arabic and Persian languages which signify bolstering or quilting of the petticoats, to give an appearance of that

fine ſwell below the waiſt, which thoſe people eſteem as one of the greateſt elegancies of the female ſhape. Falſe hair is alſo frequently alluded to; and feathers appear to have been more generally worne, than they were even lately by the ladies of England.

I HAVE now in my poſſeſſion a valuable Eaſtern manuſcript, the property of General Carnac, Governor of Bombay; which he purchaſed when Commander in Chief of the Eaſt India Company's forces in Bengal, for 1000 rupees (125 l.) * It contains extracts from the fineſt authors, eſpecially Perſian; ſome of which are ornamented in the Eaſtern manner, with drawings of the heroes and heroines of their poems. Some of the faces have conſiderable merit; and the dreſs of the Princeſſes, when unveiled, has, in many reſpects, a reſemblance to ſome of the faſhions of Europe. They are often drawn without any head-dreſs: the hair dark; and the ringlets waving down over their neck and ſhoulders. They have frequently round their heads a kind of diadem,

* I embrace this public opportunity of expreſſing my ſenſe of various marks of politeneſs which I have received from General Carnac; and particularly the obliging manner in which he offered me the unlimited uſe of a moſt valuable collection of Eaſtern manuſcripts.

ſet with precious ſtones; from which riſe one or more tufts of feathers: the quills of which are ſet in ſockets of gold and gems. Sometimes they have a ſhort ſtubbed appearance; and ſometimes they are long, and flow gracefully backwards. They wear ſometimes noſe-jewels, which thoſe who have not been accuſtomed to them can never think a beauty. They have alſo ear-rings, not only in the lob, but in the upper part of the ear. Their necklaces conſiſt of many rows of jewels, the loweſt of which hang down over the boſom. Their dreſs, in general, when the upper garment is laid aſide, is fitted exactly to the ſhape; and ſeems nearly to reſemble what, I believe, is called a Jeſuit; buttoning down the breaſt, covering the neck pretty high, and the arms down to the wriſts. There is ſometimes a large ſquare jewel on the fore part of the arm, a little below the ſhoulder. Their girdles are very broad, generally made of fine leather; and covered entirely over with embroidery and gems. Their robes are long and flowing behind: and their ancles are often encircled with a ring of gold, ornamented with jewels. Upon their head they wear ſometimes a low-crowned cap, terminating in a point, round which they wreathe ſeveral folds of fine linen or ſilk; to the top of which, when they go abroad, they

faſten, with a gold bodkin, a veil which covers the face and a great part of the body. There are few of the female faces which have not one or two black moles or artificial marks; which the Perſians name *Khal*, and the Arabians *Ulteh*.—Women of inferior rank, who cannot purchaſe jewels, make their necklaces, bracelets, and other ornaments, of ſmall ſhells, or beads of different coloured glaſs. [x]

It may be obſerved, before we finiſh this article of dreſs, that face and eye-painting are alſo in uſe among the men; who pay the ſame attention to their beards, which the women pay to their hair. They perfume them highly, and often tinge them; ſometimes of a fine red, ſometimes with ſaffron, and with various other dyes. Red was the favourite colour of Mohammed, Abubeker, or Omar: and their example was greatly followed. [y]

SECT. III.

Of the Paſſive Obedience of Aſiatics. The diſtinguiſhing manners of the Eaſt and Weſt not always attended to by the learned. Mr. Bryant's criticiſm, on this head, conſidered. Implicit ſubmiſſion of the Carmathians to their chiefs. And of the Aſſaſſins or ſubjects of the Old Man of the Mountain.

THAT ſteady ſyſtem of conſtitutional government, founded upon laws, which, whilſt it gives to the monarch a ſolid dignity, points out to the ſubject the happy medium between rational obedience and abject ſubmiſſion, has, in all times, been imperfectly known in the Eaſt. There the deſpotiſm of the prince, checked only by the momentary and deſultory reſiſtance of the people, alternately curbs and unreins the ſpirit: and places the Aſiatic character in lights ſo oppoſite, that we muſt not be ſurprized to find a ſingular mixture of ſlaviſhneſs and freedom in the deſcription of the ſame people.

A PROPER attention to diſtinguiſhing characteriſtics is not, however, always to be found in the remarks of the learned. They too often decide with precipitation. They form their ideas of Aſiatic objects by the ſtandard alone of ancient and modern Europe; and treat perhaps rather too lightly whatever is foreign to their own line of obſervation. It is with pain that I find myſelf under the neceſſity of bringing this obſervation home to Mr. Bryant; and of differing ſo often and ſo pointedly from a gentleman, whoſe erudition, opportunities, and ingenuity, *properly directed*, might have greatly extended our knowledge, and happily guided our reſearches into the darker periods of the hiſtory of man. But, wedded, with ſome ſuperſtition, to one language, and to one ſet of writers, he looks proudly down upon all ſcience, without his own pale; and conſiders facts, perfectly conſiſtent with Eaſtern manners, as preciſely on a level with the Tales of Mother Gooſe.[b]

To illuſtrate the oppoſite ſenſes of the ſame words, in different dialects of Arabia, I had introduced into my Diſſertation (p. 5.) a ſhort anecdote of the King of Arabia Felix and an envoy. This has given Mr. Bryant field for a pretty diſplay of humour. He has embelliſhed my ſimple tale with a very facetious

BRANCH

counterpart. And as it may poſſibly amuſe the reader, to avoid doing him injuſtice by any attempt to abridge it, I ſhall throw the whole into the notes *.

* "The ſtory, p. v. concerning the envoy, who was ſent to the Tobba of Arabia, is equally extraordinary and entertaining. The prince, it ſeems, upon the envoy being introduced, ſaid to him, T'heb, *be ſeated.* But this, in the dialect of the perſon ſpoken to, unluckily ſignified—*precipitate yourſelf:* which proved an unfortunate circumſtance. For the poor envoy, *with a ſingular deference for the orders of his ſovereign,* went and threw himſelf from the wall of the caſtle, and broke his neck. Now the commands of princes ought without doubt to be heeded: yet I believe in this caſe few would have ſhewn ſuch *ſingular deference* at ſo ſudden warning. One ſhould think, that a perſon would have heſitated a little, and have made ſome ſmall inquiry before he had ventured all for nothing. In later times a ſenſible man may have ſhewn a miſtaken regard; and have been led into an errour: but hardly into one ſo fatal, as that mentioned above, However there have been facts ſomewhat ſimilar: and as nothing ſets off a hiſtory to ſuch advantage, as its parallel, accept what follows by way of illuſtration: for the preciſe truth of which I will not vouch: but give it you as I receive it. The perſon concerned is ſuppoſed to have been, like the man above, an envoy: one, who reſided here in the reign of Queen Elizabeth: but of what country is not ſaid: though from his great politeneſs ſome judgment may perhaps be formed. He is repreſented as very infirm, and gouty: and at the ſame time troubled with a painful retention. The MSS.

It is a happy talent, we muſt confeſs, to trifle gracefully. Yet how few poſſeſs it! Below indeed we find a vein of pleaſantry, which we do not diſcover every where. And, as my poor ſtory has happily breathed this vein, it would be wrong to regret the inſertion of it, were it even irreconcileable with hiſtory and manners. It happens, however, not only to be recorded by many Aſiatic writers, as well as by D'Herbelot, Sale, and other European Orientaliſts; but is in ſuch perfect conformity with that enthuſiaſtic deference, which people have been known, even in later times, to pay to the moſt dreadful

in which he is mentioned, deſcribes him in the following manner. *He was a very aged, and a very coſtive Lord: and ſo marred in his knees and in his ancles with the gout, that he could ſcant ſtond. One day, when he was in Privy Chamber, the Queen's Majeſtie noting his infirmities, ſayd unto him: Good my Lord, I wiſh, that you could procure yourſelf a ſtool. He not truly apprehending her Grace's meaning through default of language, but thinking of his private malady, went incontinent home: and took ſo many laxatives, enemas, and cathartics, that he was well nigh killed. And though they gave him Hippocraſs, and many cordial apozems, yet from Allhallowtide to Saint Swithin his bowels were like a bladder. Nor did they recover themſelves in a year, they were ſo angered and aggrieved.* Whatever miſtake may have been made, we ſee here the utmoſt complaiſance: and this too, let me tell you, in very critical circumſtances. Nothing

commands of their chiefs; that, were the best facts, which support the learned gentleman's *Cuthite System*, but half as well grounded, his castle's strength might laugh a siege to scorn. [d]

I SHALL mention a few examples. The Carmathians were a powerful Sect of Arabian Schismatics; who began to appear towards the end of the ninth century; and, before the conclusion of the following, had made themselves masters of some of the finest provinces of Babylonian Irak. About the year 930, after ravaging the territory of Mecca, plundering the city, defiling the temple, and destroying near 40,000 people; their prince,

could be more proper, than the regard shewn to the supposed good wishes of a princess; whose wishes were esteemed equal to commands. But I must confess, when a regard of this sort is extended to hanging or drowning, or to breaking one's neck, it seems to be carried rather too far. And whatever sense of duty a person may entertain, yet I should imagine, that he would think twice, before he implicitly obeyed: for a leap down a precipice is no jesting matter. In good truth, if I may be allowed to speak freely, histories of this sort are very little superior to those of that respectable lady, Mother Goose. On this account, I should imagine, that in your future publications they had better be omitted, lest the Persians should be esteemed as great fablers as the Greeks."

Abu Thaher, had the boldneſs to appear before Baghdad with only 500 horſe. The Khalif's general marched out to ſeize him at the head of 30,000 men: but before he attacked him, he ſent an officer to ſummon him to ſurrender. "How many men has "the Khalif's general?" ſays Abu Thaher. "Thirty thouſand," anſwers the officer. "Amongſt them all," returns the Carmathian chief, "has he got three like "mine?" Ordering his followers then to approach, he commanded one to ſtab himſelf, a ſecond to throw himſelf from an eminence, and a third to leap into the Tigris. He was inſtantly obeyed, and all of them periſhed. Then turning to the officer; "He that has "ſuch troops values not the number of his "enemies." And indeed thoſe determined men, ſurprized that night the Khalif's army; who, over confident in their numbers, kept no guard, and obſerved no precautions. Numbers were ſlain; the reſt diſperſed; and the General falling alive into the hands of Abu Thaher, he chained him amongſt his dogs.*

THERE is not a hiſtorian of the Cruzades, European, or Aſiatic, who does not mention the *Sheikhu'l'jebel*, or the *Old Man of the Mountain*. This was a name given to a dy-

nasty of Princes, who reigned in Persian Irak from about the year 1090 till 1255. The subjects of those chiefs were so entirely devoted to them, that they put themselves to death, like the Carmathians, without the least hesitation: an instance of which, similar to the former, is related by several Mohammedan writers. When *Hassan Sabah* *, the founder of this dynasty, had become formidable, the Sultan Malekshah Jelaleddin, Emiru'l'omra to the Khalif of Baghdad, sent an embassador to require his submission. Hassan, without making an immediate reply, desired one of his attendants to poignard himself; and another to leap from the battlements of the tower. He was immediately obeyed: when turning to the embassador, "Seventy "thousand are thus attentive to my com"mands. Let this be my answer." [f]

These chiefs, from the devoted enthusiasm of their followers, became the terror of all the neighbouring princes; whom they laid under contribution: for death was generally the consequence of their displeasure. Their subjects would assume any disguise, and penetrate into any place, fearless of the con-

* From the name of *Hassan*, it is possible the word *Assassin* may be derived.

ſequences, provided they could ſucceed in the murder they were ſent to execute. Amongſt many great men who fell by theſe aſſaſſins, were Amer Billah Khalif of Egypt, Moſtarſhed Khalif of Baghdad, and the Vizir Nezam ul Mulk, whom I have ſo often mentioned. The great Saladin very narrowly eſcaped. He was attacked by three of them in his tent, and was wounded; but having great ſtrength of arm, he ſeized them, and, calling to his guards, they were ſoon diſpatched.[g]

THE murder of the Marquis of Montferrat, by two of thoſe men, makes a great figure in the hiſtory of the Cruzades. They had diſguiſed themſelves like Chriſtian Monks, and ſtabbed him in the ſtreets of Tyre, when returning from dining with the Biſhop of Beauvais. They were immediately ſeized; and put to the moſt excruciating torture: but they ſuffered death without making any confeſſion. As our Richard I. was then at open variance with the Marquis, the ſuſpicion of many of the Princes of the Cruzade fell heavy upon him; which reaching the ears of the Old Man of the Mountain, he addreſſed the following curious letter to Leopold Duke of Auſtria.[h]

To Leopold Duke of Austria, the Ancient of the Mountain *wisheth health.*

"Since many kings and princes beyond "seas, blame Richard King and Lord of "England, concerning the death of the Mar-"quis of Montferrat, I swear by the eternal "God, and by the law which we hold, that "Richard is no way to blame in this respect, "and that the death of the Marquis hap-"pened as follows.

"One of our brotherhood was coming in "a ship from Saltelia to our territories, and "happened to be forced into Tyre in a storm. "Upon this, the Marquis ordered him to be "put to death, and then he seized all his "money. Thereupon we sent our ambassa-"dors to the Marquis, with orders to de-"mand the money of our brother, and sa-"tisfaction for his death, which he laid upon "Reginald the prince of Sidon; whereas we "had informed ourselves by friends, whom "we could trust, that the Marquis himself "had ordered the murder to be committed, "and the money to be taken away.

"We therefore sent another ambassador, "and him he was going to throw into the "sea; but our friends hurrying him out of "Tyre, he came back to us in all haste, and

"told us how he had been treated. We, "from that hour, determined to kill the "Marquis, and we sent two of our bre-"thren, for that purpose, to Tyre, who "killed him openly, almost in the sight of "all the people of that city.

"SUCH were our motives for the death of "the Marquis: and we assure you, with "great truth, that Richard king of Eng-"land, was no ways blameable for the death "of that Marquis; and they who have done "harm to Richard on that account, do it "without justice, and without reason.

"BE assured, we will kill no man, in this "world, for reward, or for money, unless "he first injure us."

THE examples which might be brought of the desperate obedience of those men are innumerable. Almost every Eastern potentate, in self-preservation, found himself under the necessity of making magnificent presents to the Sheikhu'l'jebel. The knights Hospitallers and Templars alone set him at defiance; and even compelled him in turn to pay to them an annual tribute: for he well knew, that those republican orders could never want a head; and that the assassination of one or more Grand Masters might serve only to ex-

aſperate, without weakening, thoſe formidable bodies.[1]

YET it may be obſerved, that the importance of thoſe princes could never have reſted alone upon their own ſtrength. Devoted and fearleſs as their ſubjects might be, the power of many of the neighbouring potentates could ſoon have cruſhed them. But their private views, jealouſies and reſentments, ſeem to have operated with them in a manner nearly ſimilar to that which has long actuated the ſtates of Europe; and given a conſequence to the Barbary pirates, to which their own force alone could never have afforded them the leaſt pretenſions. Even Saladin, who, in revenge for their attempt upon his life, laid waſte the country, and demoliſhed the capital of the aſſaſſins, was induced, from ſome perſonal conſideration, not only to pardon, but even to protect them. And they ſubſiſted with more or leſs power, till the year 1255, when they were exterminated by the Tartar prince Houlagou, grandſon of Jengiz Khan. A few, however, who had been trained up in the trade of murder, eſcaped the general ruin *:

* Some of the Aſſaſſins, who fled from the ſword of Houlagou, eſtabliſhed themſelves in the province of Mazenderan on the Caſpian ſea; where they were deſtroyed by Tamerlane towards the end of the fourteenth century.

for in the year 1271, our Edward I. who had taken the croſs whilſt heir-apparent, was dangerouſly wounded by one of thoſe wretches in his own apartments at Acon. The aſſaſſin, it was ſuppoſed, had been hired by the Mohammedan governor of Joppa, by whom he was ſent to Edward, under pretence of negociating a truce: in conſequence of which, having free acceſs to the Prince's perſon, he ſuddenly aſſaulted him, and ſtabbed him on the ſhoulder: but Edward, grappling with the villain, threw him down, and diſpatched him with his own dagger. [k]

These few facts, of undoubted authority, will, I flatter myſelf, bring ſufficiently within the line of probability The Miſtaken Obedience of the Arabian Envoy: and ſatisfy, at the ſame time, the learned critic, that Epictetus was right, when he ſaid, that every thing had two handles: one, by which it might be held; the other, by which it could not. Now, though the facetious gentleman has ſhown us, that he underſtands perfectly well, *riſu quatere populum*; yet as he poſſeſſes alſo the happy talent of ſometimes agreeably miſtaking the right handle, the old philoſopher's advice might perhaps be worth attending to, Γελως μη πολυς εςω, μηδε επι πολλοις, μηδε ανειμενος —ὀλισθηρος γαρ ὁ τροπος εις ιδιωτισμον. [l]

SECT. IV.

Freedom of ſpeech in the Eaſt. Inſtances of the deference of Aſiatic princes to the complaints of their humbleſt ſubjects. Anecdote of Sultan Mahmoud. Deſtruction of a gang of dangerous banditti. Anecdotes of the Khalif Haron Arraſhid. The barbarity of this prince to his ſiſter and Vizir. The undaunted gratefulneſs of an old man. Anecdotes of Hejjaje, an Arabian governor. Veneration for ideots in the Eaſt. Probable origin of Royal Jeſters.

THOUGH the ſyſtem of Eaſtern government veſts, too often, the almoſt unlimited uſe and abuſe of power, in the hands of men, whoſe frantic caprice is a dreadful ſatire upon human nature; we, nevertheleſs, frequently diſcover, among the princes of Aſia, not only an uncommon deference to the complaints of their ſubjects; but many inſtances where the moſt ferocious tyrants have borne, without reſentment, the ſe-

vereſt truths and the keenneſt ſarcaſms, when delivered with a bold ſpirit and a ready wit. As a kind of counterpart to the preceding ſection, I ſhall conclude this chapter, with a few miſcellaneous anecdotes on this head, without much attention to connection of ſubject, or chronological order. [a]

The great deſert of Naubendigan, which ſtretches between Perſia Proper and Khoraſſan, had long been infeſted by banditti, who robbed the Caravans, and murdered the merchants. About the beginning of the eleventh century, ſoon after Perſia had been conquered by Mahmoud, Sultan of Ghezna, a Caravan was plundered; and, amongſt thoſe who fell, was the ſon of a widow. The poor woman immediately ſet out for Ghezna, and demanded juſtice of the Sultan for the life of her ſon. Mahmoud heard her complaint with attention; and then told her, that Irac being far removed from his ſeat of government, it was impoſſible to remedy every diſorder which might happen at ſuch a diſtance. "Why "then, ſays the widow, doſt thou conquer "more than thou canſt govern? Will not "an account of this be required of thee at "the day of judgment?" Struck with the juſtice of the widow's reply, Mahmoud was

not offended. He made her, on the contrary, rich presents, and promiſed her ſpeedy juſtice. He haſtened immediately to Iſphahan, and iſſued a proclamation, promiſing ſecurity, in perſon and property, to all travellers through the deſert. Many merchants flocked, in conſequence, to Iſphahan: but when the caravan was ready to depart, they were ſurprized to find only a hundred ſoldiers appointed for their guard. They repreſented to the King, that the robbers were ſo numerous and ſo bold, that a thouſand would be quite inſufficient. He knew however the meaſures he had taken, and deſired them to depart, with aſſurance of perfect ſafety. The Sultan had, in the mean time, privately ordered a number of hampers of moſt choice fruits to be poiſoned, and gave orders to the commander of the guard to halt in a certain place, where the banditti generally made their attack; and there to unload the fruits, under pretence of drying them in the ſun. This was done: and the robbers ſoon appearing, the guard, as they were ordered, fled. As nothing, in thoſe ſcorching deſerts, could be more tempting than ſuch cool and delicious fruits, the thieves knowing that the caravan might be ſoon overtaken, allowed them to move on; and devoured the fruits, with ſo little moderation

or caution, that, before they could discover the poison, it began to operate; and all of them perished on the spot. [b]

The Khalif Haron Arrashid was accosted one day by a poor woman, who complained, that his soldiers had pillaged her house, and laid waste her grounds. The Khalif desired her to recollect the words of the Alcoran, "That when princes go forth to battle, the "people through whose fields they pass must "suffer."—"Yes, says the woman; but it "is also written in the same book, that the "habitations of those princes, who autho-"rize injustice, shall be made desolate." This bold and just reply had a powerful effect upon the Khalif; who ordered immediate and ample reparation to be made. [c]

Arrashid was undoubtedly one of the greatest princes that ever reigned; and his temper was in general merciful and generous. But one action of dreadful and unrelenting cruelty must ever remain an indelible stain upon his memory. Giaffar his Vizir, of the noble family of Bermeki, was esteemed the most eloquent orator, the best writer, and the finest gentleman in the empire. The Khalif delighted in his company, and made him a partner in all the amusements

of his leisure hours. That prince had, at the same time, an amiable and accomplished sister named Abassa; in whose conversation he took also uncommon pleasure. The company of his favourites, the Khalif wished to enjoy together. But this the etiquette of Eastern courts denied; as nothing but an alliance with the royal family could give Giaffar the privilege of entering the inner apartments. To remove this obstacle, Arrashid had recourse to a singular expedient. He gave Abassa to Giaffar in marriage, but strictly enjoined him never to approach her but in his presence. Under this painful restraint they for some time lived. But nature at length proved too powerful for the Khalif's commands. They deceived his vigilance: and Abassa became with child. She was delivered without discovery: but, being betrayed by a female slave, she was driven, with ignominy, from the royal palace; and reduced to wander, in the most wretched attire, to beg the precarious charity of the meanest subject of her stern and unrelenting brother. Giaffar was beheaded. His family, his dependents, his domestics, were imprisoned, butchered, and proscribed: and death was denounced against every person, who even dared to mention the family name. Yet, such was the veneration in

which the generous Bermicedes had been held by all ranks, that, abſolute as the Khalif was, his commands were here diſregarded. An old man in particular, named Mondir, who, during their proſperity, had received from them many favours, went every day to the deſerted dwelling of the unhappy Giaffar; where, from a mound of ruins, he expatiated to thouſands of grateful hearers, on the virtues and beneficence of thoſe illuſtrious men. The Khalif, in a rage, ordered at laſt Mondir to be brought before him, and condemned him to inſtant death. The old man did not complain of the ſentence: he begged only to ſpeak a few words before he died. The Khalif conſented: when Mondir made no apology; he promiſed no change of ſentiments; and he aſked not for mercy. But he enlarged upon the benevolence of thoſe unfortunate noblemen, with ſuch pathetic eloquence, that even the Khalif was touched at length; and he not only pardoned the old man, but gave him a golden plate, which was placed before him: on receiving of which, Mondir, proſtrating himſelf before the Khalif, "Behold, ſays he, even in this, a "new favour from the noble Bermicedes."

HEJJAJE was an Arabian of diſtinction,

remarkable for military abilities, eloquence, and cruelty. He was governor of Arabia and of Babylonian Irak, towards the end of the seventh century: and he ruled with almost independent power. So great was his severity, that he is said to have put to death 120,000 people; and to have had 50,000 more in his prisons when he died. Yet many stories are told of him, which, tyrant as he was, shew that he could easily forgive a freedom of speech, if accompanied with spirit, naiveté, or wit. Having lost his attendants one day at the chace, he met an Arab pasturing his camels, and begged of him a little water. "If you want water, said the Arab surlily, "draw it for yourself; for I am neither your "companion nor your slave." The governor accordingly alighted; and having satisfied his thirst, entered into conversation with a man, whose humour he thought singular. Among other questions, he asked him what opinion he entertained of the Khalif. "I think, says "the Arab, that he is a very wicked prince." —"Why?"—"Because he has sent us "Hejjaje, the most execrable governor under "heaven." The governor was silent; but, his attendants soon after appearing, he ordered them to bring the Arab along with them. Next day he seated him with him at

table, and desired him to eat freely. "God "send, says the Arab, the end of the repast "may be no worse than the beginning."— "Do you recollect, says the governor, what "you said yesterday?"—"Yes, yes, replies "the Arab, May God prosper you in all "things; but as for the secret of yesterday, "take you good care not to divulge it to "day."—"Well then I will not; but of "two things you must chuse: either to ac"knowledge me as your master, and I will "retain you in my service; or I will send "you to the Khalif, and inform him of your "speech."—"There is a third course, re"joins the Arab, which is worth them "both."—"What is that?"—"Send me "home, and pray God, that we may never "see one another more." The governor smiled at the blunt humour of the man; and dismissed him agreeable to his wish, with a present of a thousand dirhems.— Informers having told Hejjaje, that Ziad, a man of rank, had publicly and vehemently exclaimed against his proceedings, he immediately ordered him to be seized; and demanded whether he had not, in a certain garden, wished that God might turn his face black, that his head were struck off, and his blood spilt. "Those, says Ziad, who have repeated my

"words, have been very exact: but they "should have told you also, that I was then "under an arbor, admiring some excellent "grapes, which were not ripe: so I wished "them instantly black in the face, that I "might cut off their heads, and shed the "blood of the vine." The ingenuity of the turn, so much pleased the governor, that, instead of dooming him to death, as he purposed, he took him immediately into favour. —Having quelled a rebellion, the governor had ordered the chiefs to be put to the sword; when one of them cried out, "Hejjaje, I "appeal to your justice."—"Upon what "ground?"—"Our general having one day "reviled you, I told him he did wrong."— "Have you any witness of this?"—"I "have," pointing to one of his condemned companions.—"Is it true?" says the governor, addressing himself to the officer appealed to.—"It is," replied he.—"And why did "not you do as much as that man?"— "Because, returned he fiercely, you were mine "enemy."—Hejjaje, instead of resenting this boldness, pardoned both: the one, to acknowledge the obligation: the other, for the undauntedness with which he had spoken the truth.—The rigour of this governor, whose humour was in general his only rule of con-

duct, is sufficiently evident from the numbers he destroyed: and it is difficult to read the history of such men, without execrating a system of government, which could thus expose the lives and properties of subjects, unprotected by fixed laws, to the wanton phrenzy of an unfeeling despot. Yet the manners of the times may furnish, perhaps, some apology for barbarites which strike the humane with horror. Hear, upon this head, the sentiments of this haughty chief. Loud complaints having gone abroad of his violence, he assembled the people; and, mounting his tribunal, he thus harangued them: "God has now given me dominion over you. "If I exercise it with severity, think not, "when I am gone, that your condition will "be mended. As you live, you ought ever "to be crushed: for God has many servants: "and, when I am no more, another will "come, who may execute his orders still "more sternly. If you wish your governors "to be moderate and merciful, be ye just, "and obey their commands. Your own conduct must be the basis of your good or bad "treatment. A prince may be compared to "a mirror. All that is seen in him is merely the reflexion of surrounding objects. If

"you are virtuous, he will be mild. If you "are corrupted, he muſt be a ſcourge."

Tamerlane, whoſe common ſaying it was, that a ſovereign could never be ſafe upon his throne, unleſs it was ſurrounded with blood: who could, with indifference, make pyramids of heads; and bake thouſands alive in a mud pye, or pound them in a mortar: this Tamerlane could yet liſten, without reſentment, to the raillery of poets, the cenſure of the learned, and the perſonal inſults of real or pretended fools. To the circumſtances which I have mentioned in the former part of this diſſertation (p. 192, &c.) many might be added: but I ſhall only now obſerve, that the ſuperſtitious reſpect which Eaſtern people have entertained for ideots, is wonderful. Their ſayings have been conſidered as bordering upon inſpiration; and, in this idea, they have been indulged with an uncommon freedom of ſatirical licence. This ſingular degree of veneration which has been ſhewn for natural ideots, might often, we may eaſily believe, induce artful men to counterfeit folly; either to advance their fortunes, or, to give them the power of ſpeaking freely their ſentiments, with impunity. And, to this cauſe, I think, it is not unnatural to trace the ori-

gin of Royal Jeſters. At what period the King's fool was introduced into European courts, it is not material at preſent to enquire: but we find him in the Eaſt in the eighth century; and he was probably much older. At the court of the Khalif Arraſhid there was one named Bahalul Almejnoun; ſome of whoſe ſayings have been preſerved. He appears to have poſſeſſed vivacity, wit, and obſervation; and he was permitted to take every kind of licence with the Khalif and his courtiers. "I wiſh, ſays Arraſhid to him "one day, you could procure me a liſt of all "the fools in Baghdad."—"That would be "difficult, Commander of the Faithful; but "if you deſire to know the wiſe men, the "catalogue may be ſoon completed."—A courtier telling him, that the Khalif had given him the charge of all the bears, wolves, foxes, and monkeys in his dominions; "The "Commander of the Faithful has given me "then a very extenſive charge: for it com-"prehends his whole empire; and you are "one of my ſubjects."—Entering one day into the preſence-chamber, and finding the throne empty, he ſeated himſelf on it: when the officers in waiting perceiving him, pulled him down, and baſtinadoed him out of the hall. Bahalul fell a-crying; and the Khalif,

ſoon after appearing, enquired into the matter. The officers told him, that it was on account of a few blows he had received for his inſolence. "No, ſays the fool, my complainings ariſe not from the blows: they "are cauſed by my compaſſion for the Commander of the Faithful: for if I have received ſo many baſtinadoes for ſitting upon "that throne but for one minute in my life, "how many ſhould he endure, who mounts "it every day?" [f]

A REAL or affected fool, during the reign of this prince, had the preſumption to call himſelf God Almighty. The Khalif thinking him an impoſtor, ordered him to be brought before him; and, that he might diſcover the truth, he ſaid to him; "A fellow "the other day, who aſſumed the manners "of an ideot, pretended to be a prophet of "God. I had him immediately tried, when "his impoſture appearing evident, I commanded his head to be ſtruck off."—"You "did right, replied the fool, and like a faithful ſervant of mine; for I never gave that "fellow a commiſſion to be my prophet." The ready coolneſs of the anſwer left the Khalif at a loſs how to decide: he inclined therefore to the merciful ſide: and the fool was diſmiſſed. [g]

When Mahmoud Sultan of Ghezna conquered India, he had diſtreſſed the people greatly by plundering, as well as by the contributions and taxes which he impoſed. Whilſt he was one day ſitting in his Divan, in converſation with his nobles, a fool wandered into the hall; and, ſtaring wildly around, ſpoke much to himſelf, but took no particular notice of any perſon. The prince obſerving him, deſired his officers to aſk him what he wanted. He ſaid, that he was hungry; and wiſhed, of all things, to eat a roaſted ſheep's tail. The Sultan, in a frolic, ordered them to cauſe a particular kind of radiſh to be roaſted, much reſembling in ſhape thoſe tails, which in ſeveral Eaſtern countries are very fat, and of an extraordinary ſize. It was accordingly preſented to the fool, who devoured it voraciouſly. The Sultan then aſked him, how he liked it: to which he anſwered, "That it "was exceedingly well dreſſed; but he could "eaſily perceive, that, under his government, "the ſheeps tails had no longer the fatneſs, "nor the excellent flavour, for which they "were famous in former times."—Mahmoud felt the poignancy of the anſwer; and gave immediate orders to relieve the people of many burthens under which they groaned. Eccentric ſayings indeed from eccentric men,

we ſhall often find, will more powerfully influence a haughty prince, than the moſt ſerious remonſtrances of his miniſters, or the loudeſt murmurings of his people.[h]

The bounds of my volume, and an attention to more important engagements, make me here take leave of theſe ſubjects; which to ſome indeed may poſſibly appear trifling. Yet, from ſuch ſlight obſervances, we ſhall often judge more truly of the genius of a people, than from more ſolid objects: for, as Selden juſtly remarks, if we throw a ſtraw into the air, we may eaſily ſee how the wind ſits; which we ſhall not do by caſting up a ſtone.[i]

CHAPTER II.

SECT. I.

Reasons for the Remarks in the preceding sheets, Introduction to a further examination of Mr. Bryant's Mythology.

IT was an excellent maxim, which Lord Bacon, Mr. Boyle, and other philoſophers ſucceſsfully adopted, not only to promote ſcience by experiments and other modes of convincing proof; but to throw out conjectures upon ſuch ſpeculative points, as they had not ſufficient opportunities or leiſure to inveſtigate fully: with the view that thoſe conjectures, properly purſued by men of reflexion, might lead in time to ſome important diſcovery. †

† To ſome obſcure hints upon *Attraction*, thrown out by Lord Bacon, the world is, in a great meaſure, indebted for the great *Newtonian Syſtem*.

It was in imitation of thoſe great men, that I have, in the preceding ſheets, hazarded ſome looſe thoughts on ſeveral ſubjects, which to me appeared to be either new, or capable of being placed in a new light. If founded even on miſtake, I apprehended they could do no harm: but, if conſiſtent with reaſon, they might tend to ſome improvement. As ſketches only they were deſigned; and merely as ſuch I wiſh them to be conſidered. The variety of topics, upon which I have touched, and the limits to which I was neceſſarily confined, were by no means calculated for deep criticiſm, or extenſive enquiry. Such indeed was never my intention. My abilities, a few weeks, and a few pages, could not allow me to entertain the idea. My chief object was to aſſiſt ſtudents in Eaſtern tongues, with ſuch remarks as came within my line of obſervation: my next, to remove, if I could, the prejudices of the learned, by pointing to lights, which Eaſtern erudition, judiciouſly applied, might poſſibly throw upon many branches of uſeful knowledge.

But I ſoon perceived, that this ſecondary object could not ſuddenly meet with ſucceſs. I diſcovered, that there were faſhions in literature, as well as faſhions in dreſs: that ſome led the taſte: that many followed implicitly

their opinions: and that few cared to be singularly conspicuous in deviating from the received mode. When a writer high in the *ton* pronounces boldly his opinion, it becomes immediately a kind of watch-word. It flies wide abroad: the echo reverberates from every quarter: and, as a polite writer * justly observes, "A lucky word in a verse, which "sounds well, and every body gets by heart, "goes further than a volume of just criti-"cism." Boileau happened to say something of the *Clinquant* of *Tasso* and of *Virgil's gold*; and the magic of the line overturned at once the solid and well built reputation of the Italian poets.

Now, though I cannot find out, how the excellence of one class of writers can be injured by the excellence of another; yet the bare suspicion of merit in Eastern authors seems to be viewed as high treason against the majesty of Grecian learning. The courtly writer of the *New System of Ancient Mythology* has said, that it is in vain to look into them for information: he has likened their histories to the Tales of Mother Goose §: he has

* Dr. Hurd, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, on Chivalry and Romance, p. 84.

§ This watch-word has already got abroad. See what

adopted the maxim, *De railler d'un plaiſant qui ne ſait pas nous plaire:* and, with nearly the ſame knowledge of thoſe writers, which another ingenious gentleman had of Strabo and Plutarch, he ſeems to ſing, with him,

Your Straw-boys, and Blue-turks, and ſuch ſort of ſtuff!
Egad, I don't value them one pinch of ſnuff.

Peremptory indeed are the deciſions of this learned gentleman, upon every ground. But as I have of late ſeen much reaſon to ſuſpect mere aſſertions; and to think, that an undiſtinguiſhing deference for high authorities has ever tended to propagate error, to damp diſcovery, and to check improvement in every ſcience: I have freely differed from him, and from many able men; wherever I have ſeen cauſe, or found arguments to ſupport my opinions. [d]

To counteract, in ſome meaſure, the *Clinquant* of ſo great a writer, I had, in the for-

it is to be a writer of *ton!* The authors of the Gentleman's Magazine for May 1778, after a ſhort but polite review of my Diſſertation, come in upon me at the end with— "As to the marvellous ſtories he relates, they ſeem truly "Perſian or Arabian tales; and, to ſpeak freely, (as Mr. "Bryant ſays) are very little ſuperior to thoſe of that re-"ſpectable lady Mother Gooſe."—*Ah! vraiment, que ce meme Monſieur Bryant eſt un fort mauvais plaiſant!*

mer part of my Diſſertation, attacked his *Radicals*; I had glanced at his *Syſtem*; and I had endeavoured to ſhow, how doubtfully qualified he was to judge of the point in queſtion. This, it is true, has ſomewhat ruffled him: but he tries to carry it handſomely. He is indeed a merry man. Another merry man, in a periodical publication, has already ſaid ſo; and it muſt be true||. Yet the learned gentleman is ſometimes a little ſad or ſo. Something like an April day: now raining, now ſhining: laughing with one eye and crying with the other. He ſeems to wonder much what I had to do with his *Syſtem*: and, if he had given me a few good reaſons, I ſhould perhaps have wondered too. I wiſh he had prefixed, to his book, the patent which gives him the excluſive privilege of differing in opinion from all the world. For, I was really miſtaken enough to ſuppoſe, that the right, which I had to diſſent from him, was preciſely equal to the right which I had to diſſent from a Newton or a Monteſquieu: and I ſuppoſed it to be preciſely equal to that right, which the

|| After indulging, ſays this other man of humour, a vein of pleaſantry which one would not have expected from the author of the *Analyſis*. — Gentleman's Magazine for May 1778, p. 213.

learned gentleman himſelf has, with equal freedom, and more triumph, exerciſed in condemning the ſyſtems of a Pezron, of a Wiſe, and of other ingenious men.

THAT the *Mythology* ſtood more in the fore ground of my Diſſertation, aroſe entirely from the nature of the work. The learned author had, *en clinquant*, depreciated without reaſon, and without knowledge, languages which I thought it juſt to ſupport. He had framed a *Syſtem*, which had in contemplation vaſt objects indeed. It was deſcribed as *the baſis of hiſtory*; *the ſtandard of criticiſm*; *and the guide to the ſtudies of youth* †. The dark labyrinth of the early ages was his object of reſearch; and etymological analyſis his great clue of conduct. His ſcene of action lay chiefly on Aſiatic ground; yet Aſiatic languages he affected to deſpiſe. He ſubſtituted definitions, which no man ever knew; and he ſheltered himſelf behind the viſionary ſhade of an inexiſting tongue. — Yet in thoſe neglected languages, I fancied there were ſignifications expreſſive and unforced, which might illuſtrate remote antiquity. I fancied there were many, which, better than thoſe he had choſen, might have enlightened the darkneſs

† Mythology, Vol. III. Pref. p. vi. &c.

of his ingenious Syſtem: and I fancied there could be no impropriety in ſubmitting ſuch definitions for public approbation or cenſure.[f]

ALL this has much hurt the learned author. He has addreſſed to me *An Apology* ‡; where I am accuſed of miſunderſtanding his plan. He has ſaid that I had not read his book; and he has challenged me to a deeper inveſtigation. I wiſh then to convince him that I have read his book: and it is poſſible he now may think too much. I have been led to conſider his *Syſtem*, at large, with more attention: and what before ſeemed to be merely *improbable*, I now conceive, upon his own grounds, to be irreconcileable with the Sacred Writings; to be unſupported by reaſon; to be inconſiſtent with itſelf. In a word, to be *impoſſible*.[g]

To ſupport theſe poſitions I now proceed. And, as I wiſh to addreſs myſelf to the common ſenſe of general readers, whoſe line of ſtudy may not have led them to Oriental pur-

‡ This *Apology* was never *publiſhed*: it was *whiſpered* abroad: and was perhaps not intended for my inſpection. Accident alone informed me of it's exiſtence: and to the politeneſs of our much reſpected Vice Chancellor and Dr. Kennicott, I was indebted for the peruſal. This is a new mode of *apologizing*. — There is certainly *humour* in this learned gentleman.

ſuits, I ſhall arrange my obſervations under different heads, that the chief lines of evidence may not be interſected and obſcured by ſuch etymological diſquiſitions, as ſome part of the ſubject may ſtill require.[h]

SECT. II.

Inconſiſtency in the Chronology of the Analyſis.

AS chronological accuracy ought ever to form the ground-work of every rational hiſtorical deduction, it ſhould apparently have been an object of peculiar attention in the conſtruction of a *Syſtem*, which was to reform all former ſyſtems; to render ſuperfluous every future ſyſtem; and to clear up the perplexing difficulties, which had long embarraſſed our greateſt men in the chronological line. But this, I am apprehenſive, is rather to be wiſhed for, than to be found, in the *New Analyſis of Ancient Mythology.*[a]

To pave the way for the expedition of his *Cuthites*, two great eras ought to have been ſtudied with care. I mean thoſe of the *Uni-*

versal Deluge, and of the *Division of the Earth* among the posterity of Noah. As we can have no *true* lights to guide us to those great events, but the Books of Moses, it cannot be improper to enquire how far, with regard to these, the principles of the *Analysis* are just. And here it may be necessary to premise, as the learned gentleman does not appear to have sufficiently attended to circumstances of so much consequence to his hypothesis, That two systems of Chronology have, for a long time, chiefly divided the attention of the Christian world: the Patriarchal Genealogies, according to the Hebrew Bible; and those adopted by the Septuagint. It is foreign to the present question, to enter into the discussion of a subject, on which so many learned men have differed: but, as the Hebrew, from which our translation is made, has long been almost generally received into common use, it seems to be incumbent upon every writer, who chuses to depart from that system, to assign his reasons, and to inform his readers, upon what canons he proposes to proceed. This however the learned gentleman has not done: neither has he adhered to any regular standard. He has taken the range of many volumes: and his extracts are copious. But their jarring chronologies he seems

to have followed without reflexion; and to have involved himſelf in a labyrinth of perplexity, which makes him at variance with the Bible, with its verſions, and with himſelf. By the Hebrew Bible, the Deluge happened in the year of the Creation 1656: by the Septuagint, in 2262: and both agree in fixing the Diviſion of the Earth to the days of Peleg. [b]

THE *Migration* of the poſterity of Noah to the different regions aſſigned to them by divine appointment, the learned gentleman labours to prove, as the leading point of his *Syſtem*, to have been an event prior to the *Babel Diſperſion.* And this Migration, on the authority of Euſebius, he has placed in the year of the world 2672, when Noah was 930 years old. But in another place, tranſcribing from Epiphanius, he ſuppoſes Noah to have reſided with his poſterity, before the Migration 659 years, in the neighbourhood of Mount Ararat, where the ark is ſaid to have reſted after the Deluge *. Theſe facts and dates he conſiders as undiſputed; he reaſons from them, and makes them the groundwork of his ſubſequent poſitions. [c]

* Mr. Bryant, after obſerving that the diſtribution of the earth was by divine appointment, quotes the following words of Euſebius, "The diſtribution of the earth

Now let us try their validity. And first, by the chronology of the Hebrew Bible. The Flood, as before observed, happened in the year 1656: Noah, being then 600 years of

" happened in *the two thousand six hundred and seventy-second* " year of the creation, and in the *nine hundred and thirtieth* year of the Patriarch's life. Then it was that " Noah, by divine appointment, divided the world between his three sons."—The like is found, he adds, in Syncellus, Epiphanius, and other writers.—Many of the Fathers, says Mr. Bryant afterwards, were of opinion, that they (the posterity of Noah) did not for some ages quit this region. According to Epiphanius, they remained in the vicinity of Ararat for five generations, during the space of *six hundred and fifty-nine years.* " After " the ark, upon the decrease of the waters, had rested upon the mountains of Ararat, upon that particular eminence called Lubar, which bounds the countries of " the Armenians and Cardueans; the region where it " settled became the first place occupied by mankind. " Here the Patriarch Noah took up his residence, and " planted the vine. In this place he saw a large progeny " descend from him, children after children—to the fifth " generation, for the space of six hundred and fifty-nine " years."——As the learned gentleman has been at much pains to shew, that these Fathers were very wrong, in many points of less importance, it is wonderful he did not question them, upon the very ground-work of his *System.* Vid. Mythology Vol. III. p. 15. 22. Euseb. Chron. p. 10. Syncel. p. 89. Epiphan. l. 2. t. 2. p. 703. l. 1. p. 5 and 6.

BRANCH
age. He lived afterwards 350 years, and died in the year 2006. Peleg, in whose days the earth is declared by Moses to have been divided, was born in the year 1757; and died in 1996. But, according to the calculations adopted by the learned gentleman, the *Division*, instead of being in the lifetime of those two patriarchs, could not take place till 666 years after the death of Noah; and 676 after the death of Peleg. Whilst, in the other passage, as quoted from Epiphanius, a still greater impossibility is supposed: for Noah is there said to have been alive 659 years after the deluge; which would not only postpone the Migration 249 years later than 2672, which he had already determined upon, but extend Noah's life to 1259 years; although every concurring authority makes the sum of his age to have been only 950. [4]

Let us now consider these positions by the Septuagint chronology. Noah, at the era of the flood, which is fixed by the chief copies of that version to the year 2262, was, as above noticed, 600 years old: to which, if we add the 350 years he lived after it, he must have died in the year 2612, sixty years before the migration, instead of being alive twenty years afterwards. Whilst Peleg, not

having been born, agreeable to the Septuagint, till the year 2794, the Migration, according to the date the learned gentleman has followed, must have taken place 122 years before his existence.[e]

But, however inconsistent he might have been with all the chronologies of the Sacred Writings; a conformity with himself might perhaps have been expected. But even this we do not find. I have neither time, inclination, nor room, to dwell upon many points. I shall only mention one. In his investigation of the Egyptian Dynasties, he places the Exodus of the children of Israel, in the year before Christ 1494; (which is within about two years of our Bible chronology): their residence in Egypt he computes at 215 years: the Shepherd kings, whom he supposes to be *Cuthites*, ruled over Egypt 259 years; and were expelled 37 years before the settlement of Jacob and his sons. Now if these sums are added together, the *Cuthite* Invasion must have been 2005 years before Christ; or (as he here goes by the Hebrew chronology) in the year of the world 1999; which is no fewer than 673 years before he, in another place, makes them, or any of the sons of Noah, to have moved from the spot where the ark rested after the flood. So that the

three great objects of this elaborate work; the *Deluge*, the *Migration*, and the *expeditions of the sons of Chus*, are left, in a point of such importance as time, so wholly unsettled, as to vary in every circumstance: and to differ in some, near 800 years.[f]

To borrow a favourite word from the learned gentleman, there is something *chaotic* in all this. — Will he allow me to suppose any writer of general history to have dated one fact by the Olympiads; another by the the era of Nabonassar; and a third by the epoch of the Seleucidæ? should we in another place find, according to the authors from whom he had transcribed, the Christian, the Dioclesian, and the Mohammedan eras, promiscuously followed, without specification or arrangement: what opinion would the learned gentleman entertain of that writer's accuracy? What judgment would he form of his authenticity, even in facts he could not disprove? — He might indeed give him credit as a very ingenious compiler: he might possibly admire his fancy for the marvellous: but whilst his eras were thus a-dancing the hays, I am much afraid he would think rather irreverently of his authority; and look upon him as a merry man, should he gravely

tell us, *that his Book was to be the basis of History, the standard of criticism, and the guide to the studies of youth.*[g]

SECT. III.

Of Mr. Bryant's Theory of the Dispersion; and of the expeditions of the Sons of Chus,

IN the former part of this Dissertation, (p. 110) I have observed, that the Sacred Writings afford no light to trace the wanderings of the Cuthites: and Mr. Bryant, in his *Apology*, expresses much surprize at this opinion †. But as he has produced no arguments to shake it, I shall endeavour not only

† The basis of his hypothesis he pretends to find in the following words: "It is said by Moses, that Chus begat "several children, and among them Nimrod, who built "Babel. And it is farther said, that those, who built "Babel, *the friends and associates of Nimrod*, were disper- "sed." *Apology*, p. 79. In respect to this, I shall only beg leave to know in what part of the Sacred Writings the words in Italics are to be found. The rest will not in the least support his System.

to defend what I have already ſaid; but to ſhow, that his doctrine of the Diſperſion has no foundation in hiſtory or reaſon: that it is in oppoſition to Scripture: and deſtructive even of the ſyſtem he propoſes to ſupport.[a]

PREPARATORY to the great part which he makes the Cuthites play upon the theatre of the world, there are a chain of leading circumſtances, taken for facts, which are preciſely the very points that require moſt of all to be demonſtrated. For the leaſt failure in the truth of one link deſtroys the reaſoning; confounds the ſubſequent events; and leaves the whole a complete fable.[b]

1. THE General Diviſion of the earth, he ſays, was diſtinct from and prior to the Babel Diſperſion (Mythol. Vol. III. p. 18. et ſeq.). 2. That, at the general Migration, Shem and Japhet departed immediately from Ararat, for the regions allotted to them: but the line of Ham, and particularly the ſons of Chus, rebelling againſt the divine appointment, remained for ſome time behind: and, then marching off under Nimrod, took a circuit towards Chaldea; from whence they forcibly ejected Aſhur (ib. p. 17. 22. et ſeq.) 3. That this body, under Nimrod, were thoſe who (Gen. ch. xi.) are ſaid to have journeyed from the Eaſt to the Plain of Shinar: that they

were the builders of the Tower: and that they were the only objects of the Dispersion. (ib. p. 23. 26. &c.) [c]

As it is immaterial to the present disquisition, to enquire how far the first position may be just or not, I shall, for the sake of argument, allow it, however uncertain, to be still possible: and proceed to consider, whether the other heads, supposing this first principle admitted, will stand the touchstone of truth or probability. [d]

Now let us suppose, with the learned gentleman, all mankind to be still in the vicinity of Mount Ararat: and the Division of the earth to have been just made by the divine appointment, agreeable to his own allotment. (Vol. III. p. 17.) "The children of Shem "in general had Asia for their lot; and Ja-"phet had Europe, and Ham the large con-"tinent of Africa." With this distribution, we are told the Cuthites were dissatisfied. They would not migrate with the other branches of Noah's family. They wandered about, for some time, not in the route to their appointed country: and made at length a violent trespass upon the sons of Shem. But where is the least evidence of this disobedience, upon which so much is made to depend? Does Scripture, either directly, or by

implication, give it countenance? Does any authentic record of profane hiſtory aſſert it? And from whence indeed could ſuch diſcontents ariſe? Africa, it may be ſaid, is inferior to Aſia and to Europe. But how could the Cuthites form the leaſt idea of their portion till they had ſeen it? Whilſt all mankind were ſtill at Ararat, how was it poſſible for them to diſcover, without inſpiration, what regions in the world were preferable to the reſt? Egypt, and the Mediterranean coaſts of Africa, are, at the ſame time, amongſt the moſt delightful regions of the univerſe. There the firſt colonies of the line of Ham are ſuppoſed to have ſettled: and there a great ſuperabundance of room muſt have ſtill remained, for many ages after the original migration. But had theſe diſtricts, on the contrary, preſented nothing to the eye, but rugged rocks and parching ſands, ſtill how could this be diſcovered till they were ſeen? Before we can conceive murmurings, rebellion, and violence, even in the moſt degenerate times, we ſhould naturally know for what. But here, according to the learned gentleman's own hypotheſis, in the golden age of the world, whilſt mankind lived under the mild rule of the great patriarch; before laws were enacted or penalties known; to ſuppoſe a ſet of men, ſtimulated neither by reſentment, by oppreſſion, nor by ambition,

perversely to resist the great designs of Omnipotence; to reject a settlement which they did not know, but to which they had a right; and where, as being unpossessed, they could meet with no opposition: merely to depart, by a painful route, in search of another, of which they knew as little; to which they had no right; and where, as being already occupied, resistance must naturally be expected from the original settlers: seems to be by much too improbable to be supported solely by conjecture. Positive proof alone ought to give such suppositions a title to our belief: but especially where they are made the basis of a System. [e]

One obstacle is *presumed*, indeed, to the migration of this family; and some *surmises* are brought to support the *presumption*. The passes towards the South through the Gordyean hills, he supposes, might possibly have been more difficult, than those to the East or to the West. But, allowing them for one moment to have been so, How again could the Cuthites have learnt those difficulties? How could they know, whether there were mountains or plains, woods or deserts, rivers or seas, between them and their destined place, till they had once set out; till they had attempted a passage; till they had found it impracticable; and been forced to return? But

are those attempts or those disappointments any where related? If not: where, but in a warm imagination, could those fancied obstacles have originated? [f]

But even the difficulty of this route, after all, seems founded upon no good evidence: and nothing can more clearly discover the feebleness of the supposition, than the circumstances which are advanced to give it the colour of argument. The difficulty of passing those mountains, he thinks, may be conjectured from the retreat, in after-times, of the 10,000 Greeks. But, not to enter into the minute detail of a march, which appears to have nearly as much connexion with the supposed route of the sons of Ham, as with Hannibal's passage of the Alps; it may be just sufficient to consider, the South-west bearing of Africa from Armenia, and compare it with the course which Xenophon describes; to be perfectly convinced, that the two routes must have cut one another nearly at right angles; and that the point of contact must have been, of consequence, a mere spot; a mile, half a mile, a few yards: beyond which those routes could not have one inch in common. [g]

But could any illustration be more unsatisfactory than the above, it must, I think, be the idea which immediately follows: —

"But in the times of which we are treat-
"ing they must have been still more difficult
"to be surmounted: for, after the deluge,
"the hollows and vallies between these hills,
"and all other mountainous places, must
"have been full of slime and mud; and,
"for a great while, have abounded with stag-
"nant waters." (Vol. III. p. 24.) Now had this singular surmise the least bottom, would it not have operated equally against all the emigrants of the other branches? For, to what quarter of the heavens, from Ararat, are there not lofty mountains, divided by lower grounds? But again; how long was it after the Flood before the Migration took place? for the learned gentleman's chronology leaves us too much at large to form any precise idea. Was it 1265 years, or 1016 (by the Hebrew); or 659 or 410 (by the Septuagint)? for we are left to our conjecture for each of these numbers. Let us take then the lowest. The waters of the Deluge, which rose fifteen cubits above the highest mountains, subsided, we are informed, in a few months. Could so many years be necessary for consolidating the mud? Such mud, and such waters, as were not dried up in much less than 400 years, I am much afraid, were never intended to be naturally dried up till the end of time. [h]

Upon this ground however the learned gentleman rests: and conceives it to be sufficiently solid to entitle him to send the Sons of Chus by another route; in order to make them the people who journeyed from the East to the plain of Shinar. But, however unsupported the cause may be which produces this effect, the very track by which he leads his Cuthites might, even in point of difficulty, be sufficient to overturn the reason which induces him to send them by that way. "In respect to the Cuthites, who "seem (p. 25. Vol. III.) to have been a good "while in a roving state, they might possibly "travel to the Pylæ Caspiæ, before they "found an outlet to descend to the country "specified." And, agreeably to this idea, we have (p. 70.) a map of their supposed circuit. But the plate, though calculated entirely for the System, proves, unluckily, either by inadvertency or design, to be so much abridged, without the least apparent necessity, that the Pylæ Caspiæ are not to be found in it: and we are presented only with the departure of the Cuthites from Ararat, and their arrival in Babylonia: their intermediate course being cut off. So far, at the same time, from finding an outlet for them by the Pylæ Caspiæ, which geographers in gene-

ral consider to be Derbend; the place from whence he makes them set out, (which he supposes to be in the neighbourhood of Nakhshuvan, situated to the Northward of the Aras or Araxes) is about three degrees to the southward; and the course, which he traces on the map, proceeds, at the opening, in a south-east direction, skirting the south-west corner of the Caspian; and never again, from the nature of the track, turning to the northward. The continuation of the route from the Caspian, as I have already observed, is cut off: but, by supplying the segment of their circular course, we find them led thro' ways fully as difficult and tremendous at least as any given district of the Gordyean hills. For, from Nakhshuvan, after passing the rapid *pontèm indignans Araxes*, they must have surmounted the almost impassable chain of mountains which environ Ghilan, Mazenderan or or Tabristan; and so proceed through Persian Irak, Kuhistan, or Gebel; the very names of which are expressive of mountainous regions: and, from the concurring testimony of every historian, geographer, and traveller, are, in many places, rugged, horrible, and dangerous, even to a proverb.[i]

And here I must not omit the only authority he brings (Vol. III. p. 25.) in support of

this circular route of the Cuthites. "I was "surprized, after I had formed this opinion "from the natural history of the country, to "find it verified by that ancient historian "Berosus. He mentions the route of his "countrymen from Ararat, after the Deluge; "and says, that it was not in a straight line: "but people had been instructed περιξ προσβηναι "εις Βαβυλωνιαν, (which he interprets) *to* "*take a circuit, and so to descend to the regions* "*of Babylon.*" The learned gentleman, we repeatedly see, can build a great deal upon very slender authority. But what, after all, can this shred possibly prove in support of his hypothesis? To go *round* to Babylonia might be a mere figure of speech. It might imply to the Westward through Syria, as well as to the Eastward through Persia. It might imply a circuit of five, or of five hundred miles. It might be made to apply to the people of Shem or of Japhet, as well as to the people of Ham. It might, in a word, mean any thing; and be adapted to any system. It might mean nothing; and never have happened at all. [k]

To follow the argument, however, let us suppose the Cuthites, against all authority and reason, to have actually pursued this route: let us suppose them to have arrived at Shinar;

and to have been the actual and only builders of the Tower: but whilst they are so employed, I shall beg leave, before I proceed, to consider their supposed leader Nimrod. And here I must confess, were there even no other inconsistency, I should be much inclined to question a system, which depended so much upon a personage, whose era and history are left so uncertain as those of Nimrod. In Scripture he is only twice superficially mentioned (Gen. ch. x.—I. Chron. ch. i.); the one is but a transcript of the other; and the whole indeed is so entirely an episode, that it might with ease be omitted, without injuring in the least the Sacred Writings, where the great object is the line of Shem. The beginning of Nimrod's kingdom is said to have been Babel: but when he reigned, how long he reigned, who were his subjects, or whether his actions were good or bad, we are left entirely to conjecture. Many indeed have been the opinions of the learned: and they are almost as contradictory as they are numerous. Some consider him as a great and a good prince: some as an usurper and a tyrant. That he was a *mighty one on the earth*, and a *mighty hunter before the Lord*, is all that we learn from Moses, with regard to his character; and it is apparently torturing reason, to affix, to these expressions, meanings intrinsically vicious. That

he was an apoſtate from God, or a rebel againſt his anceſtors, are mere aſſumptions without proof; and advanced with no other view than to ſupport ſyſtems. Bochart ſays, that he rebelled againſt Noah, whom he depoſed, and uſurped the government of men. But where is the authority? Mr. Bryant beſtows liberally upon him the epithets of Arch-rebel and Apoſtate: But where again is the authority? They are no where to be diſcovered in the originals, in the verſions, nor in the paraphraſes of the Sacred Writings.[i]

As our learned author, to advance his ſyſtem, has inſiſted, that the aboriginal inhabitants of Chaldea were not thoſe who built the Tower, he has ſuppoſed that country to have been the lot of Aſhur, in the ſubdiviſion of the portion of Shem: and he has ſuppoſed, as already obſerved, that the people who journeyed from the Eaſt were Nimrod and his Cuthite tribe; by whom Aſhur was forcibly expelled. But ſtill, I am obliged to repeat, where is the authority? Moſes ſays ſimply, "Out of this land went forth Aſhur, and "builded Nineveh," &c. But where are the words which imply the prior occupancy of Aſhur? Where are the words which imply Expulſion? The more natural conſtruction would ſuppoſe a mere voluntary migration to

found a new ſtate: and, when we oppoſe obvious reaſoning, upon any ground, our facts ſhould be ſtrong. But here nothing can be more doubtful. Bochart, Hyde, and other learned men even ſuppoſe, that Aſhur, in this place, is not the name of a man, but of a country: they interpret the paſſage, *Out of that land he (Nimrod) went forth into Aſhur*; and they ſupport their opinions by the *Targum Onkeloſi*, and other authorities: which, if not perfectly ſatisfactory, ſhew clearly at leaſt, that the prior ſettlement and expulſion of Aſhur are circumſtances of a nature too obſcure, to afford good ground even for conjecture: but far leſs for a ſyſtem; which, like Aaron's rod, is to devour the ſyſtems of all preceding writers, and teach us truths hitherto concealed from all the world. Commentators have in general conſidered thoſe early ages as days of peace. Wars, they think, were not waged till hundreds of years after the Diſperſion. And, as it muſt have been perfectly agreeable to the Divine Wiſdom, that mankind, on the firſt diviſion of the earth, ſhould have ſpread themſelves without unneceſſary bloodſhed, we are not juſtified in ſuppoſing the contrary, without the moſt poſitive proof.

As the beginning of Nimrod's kingdom is declared by Moſes to have been Babel: and as

Mr. Bryant allows him to have been the first king of the whole earth; it must indeed be a contradiction in terms to acknowledge, at the same time, Ashur's previous sovereignty of Babylonia *. If the Migration therefore is to be considered as prior to the Dispersion: if the original inhabitants of Chaldea were not the Builders of the Tower: if those who journeyed from the East were the invaders of a country already possessed: it follows, that Nimrod, having been the king of the aboriginal people, could not, at the same time, be the leader of those who attacked his dominions. Nimrod, we may observe, though he might build the *city* of Babel, is no where in Scripture said to have built the *tower*; and, if those who journeyed from the East were not the whole but a part of Mankind, the most obvious conclusion we can draw is, that they were of the line of Shem; for they alone

* Any quibble, that Nimrod was a *king*, and that Ashur was not, must be a distinction without a difference. They were both chiefs of their people; both must have exerted rights of government peculiar to their age: and, whatever titles they might adopt, they must still be considered as sovereigns. Even Nimrod is not called a *king* by Moses. It is only said that the beginning of his kingdom was Babel: and the word in the original may imply the dominions of any sovereign, by whatever title he may be distinguished.

had the Eaſt for their portion. Japhet and Ham muſt have journeyed from the Weſtward: and, without evidence, we muſt do violence to our reaſon to believe the contrary. [n]

Before we diſmiſs Nimrod, I ſhould be glad juſt to know, when the learned gentleman ſuppoſes him to have lived: for, till that is determined, we ſhall be much at a loſs to account for his leading off the Cuthites from Ararat, agreeable to his Syſtem. After the extract from Epiphanius (formerly inſerted p. 390.), where Noah is ſuppoſed to have lived in the neighbourhood of that mountain 659 years after the flood; Mr. Bryant obſerves, "That the ſons of Chus went off "under the conduct of the Archrebel Nim-"rod *," Now Moſes being ſilent, with

* "During the reſidence of mankind in thoſe parts, we may imagine there was a ſeaſon of great happineſs. They for a long time lived under the mild rule of the great Patriarch, before laws were enacted, or penalties known. When they multiplied and became very numerous, it pleaſed God to allot, to the various families, different regions, to which they were to retire: and they accordingly, in the days of Peleg [none of the learned gentleman's calculations will correſpond however with the days of Peleg], did remove and betake themſelves to their different departments. But the ſons of Chus would not obey. They went off under the conduct of the archrebel Nim-

regard to the age of this prince, he has been ſuppoſed, by many commentators on the Bible, to have begun to reign in the year of the World 1757, and to have reigned 148 years. Bedford, in his Chronology, makes him to ſucceed his father, (whom he calls Cuſh or Belus II.) in the year 1960, and to have died in 2012. Whilſt others, among whom is the elaborate Dr. Jackſon, do not make his reign to commence till the year 2788, and to have laſted only ſix years.—Which of theſe will the learned gentleman chuſe? Or what other canons will he prefer? Or will he frame new ones? To which of his own epochs of the Migration will he be pleaſed, at

rod; and ſeem to have been for a long time in a roving ſtate; but at laſt they arrived at the plains of Shinar. Theſe they found occupied by Aſſur and his ſons: for he had been placed there by divine appointment. But they ejected him, and ſeized upon his dominions; which they immediately fortified with cities, and laid the foundation of a great monarchy. Their leader is often mentioned by the Gentile writers, who call him Belus. He was a perſon of great impiety; who finding the earth had been divided among the ſons of men by a divine decree, thought proper to counteract the ordinance of God, and to make a different diſtribution." Vol. III. p. 22. —To all this, I can only ſay, with the old ſong, "'Tis fine indeed, if "'twas but true!"

the ſame time, to adapt them? To the migration, in 2672, as adopted from Euſebius, none of the above will anſwer: and with that of Epiphanius in 2921, they will correſpond ſtill leſs: for, ſtretch the life of Nimrod to the utmoſt extent that imagination has given him, and he muſt have been long dead before the Cuthites, by the above hypotheſis, had moved from Ararat, or the Tower of Babel even could be thought of.

But ſtill, though every ſtep we have hitherto travelled with the Cuthites appears to be completely fanciful, to give every latitude to the argument, let us ſuppoſe them to have actually driven Aſhur out of Babylonia, and to have built the Tower. Yet, even here, I am afraid, his arguments will be diſcovered to be far from ſound. They may go a great way farther than the learned author ſeems to be aware of; for they cannot poſſibly be allowed, without injuring a much more important object. I mean the *Univerſality of the Deluge*. If the interpretation which (Vol. III. p. 27.) he has been pleaſed to give us of the 11th chapter of Geneſis, is admitted, it muſt ruin his Syſtem: as it is preciſely adopting the very line of evidence, which many learned men have urged, in ſupport of the *locality of the Flood*. And if the expreſſion *the whole*

earth, which is ſo often and ſo emphatically repeated in this chapter, is to be conſidered as a mere figurative mode of writing, and to imply only *a particular diſtrict*; the learned author gives up, with one daſh of his pen, the moſt important point in his whole book: and furniſhes his antagoniſts with the very weapons they wiſh. For, if he is permitted to make ſuch uſe of one chapter, to adapt it to his purpoſe; they will, and with juſtice, claim from him an equal right to the ſame freedom of tranſlation, in the chapters which precede: and conſider the words *All fleſh*: *every living ſubſtance*: *all the high hills, under the whole heaven*: and ſuch ſimilar expreſſions: as having merely a partial ſenſe; and to be ſimply underſtood as metaphorical figures of ſpeech. This indeed is a line of argument, which was leaſt of all to be expected from our learned author: but it ſhows, that all things, however conſequential, muſt give way to his *Cuthite Syſtem*: and that the *Univerſality of the Deluge*, though profeſſedly his chief object of inveſtigation, proves, in fact, a mere ſecondary conſideration to his favourite people. But one of theſe points he muſt give up, or he betrays both. And here indeed he has no choice. The *Cuthites* muſt fall: for this part of his own evidence becomes deciſive of their

fate. It is a two-edged weapon unſkilfully handled: for if *the whole earth*, in one line, means only a *particular province*, it muſt clearly have the ſame limited ſenſe in that which follows: "Therefore is the name of "it called Babel, becauſe the Lord did there "confound the language of *all the earth*: "and from thence did the Lord ſcatter them "abroad upon the face of *all the earth*." Now, if the Confuſion of Speech was confined to the Cuthites, and to the region about Babel; the Diſperſion muſt have alſo been confined to the ſame diſtrict. This judgement, he muſt allow, was either *general* or *limited*. If *general*, all mankind muſt have been intereſted in the building of the Tower; and all mankind muſt, of conſequence, have been diſperſed. If *limited*, and the Cuthites were the only objects of divine vengeance, their flight muſt have been limited alſo to the diſtrict of Chaldea: and their whole fanciful wanderings prove, of courſe, a baſeleſs fabric: a mere caſtle of cards, pompouſly reared upon a ſtratum of chaff. [P]

SECT. IV.

Of Sanconiathon, Manetho, Berosus.

I HAVE considered Sanconiathon, Manetho, and Berosus (p. 106) as remote fablers: and this, among other things, has much offended Mr. Bryant. But as his arguments have not given me a more favourable impression of those writers, I shall here beg leave to offer a few reasons, upon which I ground the opinion I have formed of the histories, which pass under their names. [a]

As the learned author does not build so much upon the two first, my notice of them will be proportionably short. But, as Berosus seems to be viewed as a corner stone, I shall consider him more at large. These histories, it may be observed, as we go along, if they ever did exist, which I will not positively assert, now exist no more in their original tongues. Many of those even, to whom the translations have been attributed, are now known only by name: and their fragments

broken, corrupted, and justly suspected, are handed down to us only by Eusebius and other writers posterior to the Christian era *. The subjects of which they treat, are, at the same time, chiefly antediluvian; extracted from materials heaven knows where deposited; and, in general, so wild, so impossible, and so little resembling any circumstance of our world, that, like dreams, they may be interpreted even precisely as we list.

SANCONIATHON, supposed to have been cotemporary with Gideon, drew materials,

* In the first ages of Christianity, when the fathers of the Church, the Jews, and the Heathen philosophers, were so warmly engaged in controversy, there is reason to believe, that pious frauds were not uncommon: and that when one party suspected forgeries, instead of an attempt at confutation, which might have been difficult, they had recourse perhaps to a countermine: and either invented altogether, or eked out some obscure traditional scraps by the embellishments of fancy. When we consider, amongst many literary impositions of later times, that Psalmanazar's history of Formosa, was, even in this enlightened age and country, considered by our most learned men as unquestionably authentic, till the confession of the author discovered the secret; I think it is not difficult to conceive, how forgeries of remote events, before the invention of printing and the general diffusion of knowledge, might gain an authority, and especially with the zealous, hardly inferior to that of the most genuine history.

we are told, for his Phenician antiquities, from the writings of Taaut, Hermes, or Mercury; the whole of which are ſo completely antediluvian, that there is not a ſyllable to be found in them relative to the deluge. They were pretended to have been diſcovered and tranſlated by Philo of Byblus, in the reign of the emperor Adrian: and, if they are not the entire forgeries of that writer, which has been much ſuſpected, it is generally allowed, that he has taken ſuch liberties with the original, that we have no criterion left, by which we can diſcriminate the true from the falſe. [c]

THE ſame obſervations will pretty nearly apply to Manetho. He was, we are informed, an Egyptian prieſt; and lived about 260 years before Chriſt. His dynaſties of Egyptian kings, which even thoſe who uſe them, conſider, in a great meaſure, as his own invention, are ſaid to have been taken from pillars of ſtone erected in the land of Seriad; the latitude, longitude, or even the probable exiſtence of which, no geographer or traveller, I believe, has ever yet been able to diſcover. The inſcriptions on theſe pillars were, we are informed, made by the antediluvian Thoth or Mercury. They were, ſome time after the flood, tranſlated into hieroglyphics by

Agathodæmon or Thoth the ſecond: and from ſuch reſpectable materials has Joſephus framed his aſtronomical pillars of Seth, his abſurd theory of the Shepherd kings, and half his improbable legends on ancient Egypt.[d]

Berosus, we learn, was a prieſt of the Babyloniſh deity Belus, and cotemporary with Alexander: though his ſuppoſed Annals of Chaldea were not publiſhed, as we are informed, till fifty-five years after the death of that prince. His materials, we are told by ſome authors, were compoſed partly from hieroglyphics, and partly from written records, preſerved in the Temple of his God for a period of 150,000 years *. But here we unfor-

* It is evident, though mention is made of other records, that there could be nothing but hieroglyphics, from whence Beroſus, or any writer, could compile a hiſtory of the times, of which he is ſuppoſed to have written. Yet Mr. Bryant ſays, (Vol. III. p. 108.) " And in reſpect to " what is more fully tranſmitted to us by Alexander Poly- " hiſtor from Beroſus; we may upon a cloſe inſpection " perceive, that the original hiſtory was of a two-fold na- " ture; and obtained by different means from two ſeparate " quarters. The latter part is plain, and obvious: and " was undoubtedly taken from the archives of the Chal- " deans. The former is allegorical and obſcure; and " was copied from hieroglyphical repreſentations, which " could not be preciſely decyphered." Now I will the

tunately meet with a perplexing difficulty, even at the threshold, which apparently cannot be easily surmounted. However satisfactory such records may be considered by some systematic writers, I must beg to be informed, what authority there is, that they even existed in the days of this writer. For, not only the temple of Belus, as we are told by Arrian, but every sacred place belonging to the Babylonians, were actually in ruins in the time of Alexander; supposed to have been demolished by Xerxes on his return from the invasion of Greece. When Alexander approached Babylon, after the conquest of India, he was met, according to this writer, by the Chaldean priests, who predicted to him, from the oracle of their God, some fatal accident, if he entered that city. The oracle, Alexander suspected, had no concern in this prediction: and he imputed it to the private views of the priests. He had, some time before, resolved to rebuild the temple of Belus with uncom-

learned gentleman would be consistent with himself; for (p. 123.) he says, "For my part, I believe that there "was no writing antecedent to the Law at Mount Sina." This, by the Hebrew chronology, was 857 years after the Deluge. By the Septuagint, 1577. Where then could Berosus discover, on these principles, *written* documents, relative to the Flood or to antediluvian times?

mon magnificence; and, for that purpoſe, when he marched for India, he had ordered the Babylonians to clear away the rubbiſh. But underſtanding, that, during his abſence, the work had gone ſlowly on, he declared, on his return, that he would employ his whole army in the undertaking. This was a circumſtance which the prieſts dreaded. For, great diſtricts of land, with other revenues, having been conſecrated by the Aſſyrian kings, for the ſacrifices and other ceremonies of the temple; the prieſts, after its deſtruction, had applied them to their own private emolument; and they wiſhed not to ſee them again diverted to their original uſes. From theſe apprehenſions they were only relieved by the death of Alexander, which put an end to the deſign. — Such having been the general havoc, and the ſubſequent neglected condition of the Babylonian temples, is it not natural to enquire, how the archives of 150,000 years eſcaped deſtruction? How hieroglyphics, whether upon tables or pillars, could remain undefaced? Or how any records indeed could well be ſaved from the rage of an arbitrary prince, frantic with diſappointment; who viewed the Babyloniſh ſuperſtition with horror; and ſeemed reſolved to exterminate hieroglyphics, as well as every memorial of their idol worſhip? And how, covered deep as they muſt

have been with rubbiſh, could Beroſus, or any other man, get even to the ſight of them; ſo as to deſcribe or tranſlate them, in any connected hiſtorical ſeries?

BUT I do not mean to confine my doubts of Beroſus merely to this ſuſpicious circumſtance, however ſtrong. I ſhall even ſuppoſe the hieroglyphics to have been entire; that they actually came under the inſpection of Beroſus; that he was a complete maſter of the decyphering art; and that his annals were really written in the Chaldaic language. To Africanus, Apollodorus, Alexander Polyhiſtor, and Abydenus §, it is ſaid, we are obliged for extracts: but we are not informed whether they were the tranſlators; or whether their knowledge of the Chaldaic language was ſufficient to give us any convincing idea of the fidelity of the verſion. But where are even theſe tranſlators? Are they any where now to be found? Have we even any *abſolute certainty* that they ever wrote or tranſlated one ſyllable as it now ſtands? We have fragments indeed, ſaid to have been copied from thoſe older Greek writers, preſerved by Euſebius

§ Africanus, according to Dr. Jackſon, flouriſhed in the year 220 before Chriſt; Apollodorus, 144; Alexander Polyhiſtor, 80; and Abydenus, 60.

and Syncellus. But in a state so mutilated, so adulterated, that every writer upon those subjects finds himself under the necessity of accusing them, of altering, omitting, and interpolating words, and passages, to adapt the history to their respective views and systems. Truth herself would assume the garb of falshood, if handed down to us through such corrupted mediums. In what esteem then must reasonable men, who have no hypothesis to establish, hold such wild effusions of unnatural extravagance; which, like figures in the fire, a thousand beholders might describe a thousand different ways? [f]

ONE or two extracts I have inserted in the notes; and from those the reader may form some opinion of the whole *. I do not in-

* "So much concerning the wisdom of the Chaldeans, (says Eusebius from Abydenus). It is said, that the first king of this country was Alorus; who gave out a report, that he was appointed by God to be the shepherd of his people. He reigned ten sari. Now a sarus is esteemed 3600 years. A nereus is reckoned 600; and a sosus 60. After him Alaparus reigned three sari: to him succeeded Amillarus, from the city of Pantibiblus, who reigned thirteen sari. In his time a semidæmon, called Annedotus, in appearance very like to Oannes, shewed himself a second time from the sea. After him Amenon reigned twelve sari; who was of the city of Pantibiblon. Then

tend to enlarge upon the God Belus cutting the woman asunder; and forming of her the

Megalenus, of the same place, eighteen sari. Then Daus the Shepherd governed for the space of ten sari: he was of Pantibiblon. In his time four double-shaped personages came out of the sea to land: whose names were Euedocus, Eneugamus, Enaboulus and Anementus. After Daus succeeded Anodaphus, the son of Aedoreschus. There were afterwards other kings; and last of all Sisuthrus: so that, in the whole, the number of kings amounted to ten: and the term of their reigns to 120 sari."

"Alexander Polyhistor mentions, that Oannes shewed himself in the first year (of what?) but Apollodorus says that it was after 40 sari. Abydenus, differing from both, makes the second Annedotus appear after 26 sari. *Eusebii Chronicon.* p. 5.—*Mythol.* Vol. III. p. 97. and 98.

"Moreover Oannes wrote concerning the generation of mankind: of their different ways of life, and of civil polity: and the following is the purport of what he said: There was nothing but darkness, and an abyss of water, wherein resided most hideous beings, which were produced of a twofold principle. Men appeared with two wings; some with four; and with two faces. They had one body, but two heads; the one of a man, the other of a woman. They were likewise in their several organs both male and female. Other human figures were to be seen with the legs and horns of goats. Some had horses feet: others had the limbs of a horse behind; but before were fashioned like men, resembling hippocentaurs. Bulls likewise bred there with the heads of men; and dogs with fourfold bodies, and the tails of fishes. In short, there

heavens and the earth: neither do I intend to enlarge upon his cutting off his own head: nor upon the whole animal ſyſtem which we

were creatures with the limbs of every ſpecies of animals. Add to theſe, fiſhes, reptiles, ſerpents, with other wonderful animals; which aſſumed each other's ſhape and countenance. Of all theſe were preſerved delineations in the temple of Belus at Babylon. The perſon who was ſuppoſed to have preſided over them had the name of Omerca. This in the Chaldaic language is Thalath; which the Greeks expreſs θαλασσα, the ſea; but, according to the moſt true computation, it is equivalent to (Σελήνη) the moon. All things being in this ſituation, Belus came and cut the woman aſunder: and out of one half of her he formed the earth, and of the other half, the heavens; and at the ſame time deſtroyed the animals in the abyſs. All this, Beroſus ſaid, was an allegorical deſcription of nature. For the whole univerſe conſiſting of moiſture, and animals being continually generated therein; the deity (Belus) above-mentioned, cut off his own head: upon which the other Gods mixed the blood, as it guſhed out, with the earth; and from thence men were formed. On this account it is that they are rational, and partake of divine knowledge. This Belus, whom men call Dis, divided the darkneſs, and ſeparated the heavens from the earth, and reduced the univerſe to order. But the animals ſo lately created, not being able to bear the prevalence of light, died. Belus, upon this, ſeeing a vaſt ſpace quite uninhabited, though by nature very fruitful, ordered one of the Gods to cut off his head (which we find above he had already cut off himſelf); and when it

find in shocking mascarade. I shall only make a few remarks upon the man-fish Oannes and the ten Antediluvian kings, whose reigns extended to 432,000 years; as this subject leads to an ingenious criticism of our learned author. He discovers, under the description of Oannes, we perceive, an allegorical representation of the patriarch Noah †. Now, though this resemblance may not perhaps be so striking to ordinary men; we shall acquiesce in it,—upon the same principles that we must acquiesce in one half, at least, of his learned

was taken off, they were to mix the blood with the soil of the earth; and from thence to form other men and animals, which should be capable of bearing the light."—Euseb. Chron.—Mythol. Vol. III. p. 102.

† Under the character of the *Man of the Sea*, whose name was Oannes, we have an allegorical representation of the great patriarch; whom in his other history he calls Sisuthros. His whole body, it seems, was like that of a fish: and he had under the head of a fish, another head, &c. and a delineation of him was to be seen at Babylon. He infused into mankind a knowledge of right and wrong: instructed them in every science: directed them to found temples; and to pay a regard to the Gods. He taught them also to distinguish the different sorts of seeds; and to collect the fruits of the earth: and to provide against futurity. In short, he instructed mankind so fully, that nothing afterward could be added thereto."—Vol. III. p. 109.

work:—becauſe he ſays it is ſo. Alexander Polyhiſtor, from Beroſus, (according to Euſebius) fixes the appearance of this man-fiſh to a certain year, which can be reconciled to no terreſtrial chronology. But Abydenus, from Beroſus, places this important event 93,000, and Apollodorus, alſo from Beroſus, 144,000 years after Polyhiſtor's era. Our learned author, with a laudable zeal to clear up this beautiful hiſtory, is, with much reaſon, exceedingly angry at thoſe fine old Grecians, for being guilty of ſuch ſhameful anachroniſms; and reduces the whole chaos to ſurpriſing order, by a very new hypotheſis indeed: to which, as I am unwilling to do the leaſt injuſtice, I ſhall beg leave to tranſcribe the paſſage.[x]

"We may be able to detect and confute "the abſurdity of Abydenus and Apollodo"rus; who pretend, upon the authority of "this writer (Beroſus) to produce ten Ante"diluvian kings, of whom no mention was "made by him: for what are taken by thoſe "writers for Antediluvians, are expreſsly re"ferred by him to another era. Yet have "theſe writers been followed in their notions "by Euſebius, and ſome other of the an"cients; and by almoſt every modern who "has written upon the ſubject. Their own

"words, or at leaſt the words, which they "quote from Beroſus, are of themſelves ſufficient to confute the notion. For they ſpeak "of the firſt king, who reigned, to have "been a Chaldean and of Babylon; and to "have been called Alorus. Now it is certain that Nimrod built Babel, which is "Babylon after the flood. He was a Chaldean, and the firſt king upon earth: and "he was called by many nations Orion and "Alorus. Yet by theſe writers Alorus is "made an Antediluvian prince; and being "raiſed ten generations above Siſuthrus or "Noah, he ſtands in the ſame degree of "rank as the Protoplaſt: and many in conſequence of it have ſuppoſed him to be "Adam. We are much indebted to Alexander Polyhiſtor for giving us not only a "more copious, but a more genuine extract "from Beroſus, than has been tranſmitted by "the other two writers. We know from "him that there were of that author two "books; of the firſt of which he has tranſmitted to us a curious epitome. In this "book, after having given an account of the "country and its produce, he proceeds to the "hiſtory of the people; and the very firſt "occurrence is the appearance of Oannes (ὁ "ἀνγων) the man of the ſea. He is intro-

"duced εν πρωτω ενιαυτῳ in the first year of the "history, which is no other than the first "year of the world after the flood; when "there was a renewal of time, and the earth "was in its second infancy. At this period "is Oannes introduced. But the other two "writers, contrary to the tenor of the ori-"ginal history, make him subsequent in time. "This embarrasses the account very much: "for as he is placed the very first in the prior "treatise of Berosus: it is hard to conceive "how any of these ten kings could have "been before him; especially as the author "had expressly said Εν τῃ δευτερᾳ τους ι. βασιλεας "*In the second book I shall give an account of* "*the ten kings of Babylon.* It is manifest from "hence, that they were posterior to Oannes, "and to all the circumstances of the first "book. The Grecians, not knowing, or "not attending to the eastern mode of wri-"ting, have introduced these ten kings in "the first book, which Berosus expressly re-"fers to the second. They often inverted "the names of persons, as well as of places: "and have ruined whole dynasties through "ignorance of arrangement. What the Orien-"tals wrote from right to left, they were "apt to confound by a wrong disposition, "and to describe in an inverted series. Hence

"these supposed kings, who, according to "Berosus, were subsequent to the deluge, "and to the Patriarch, are made prior to "both: and he, who stood first, is made "later by ten generations, through a rever-"sion of the true order." Vol. III. p. 111.

I MUST refer the curious reader to the Mythology itself; where the whole chain of argument will be found equally strange with the above: I shall just conclude with the manner in which the ten Antediluvians are converted into Noah, Ham, Chus, and Nimrod. "I imagine, that the original list which "has been supposed to have been a dynasty "of Antediluvian kings, was the genealogy "of Nimrod, the first king of the country; "in which were contained *four* persons; Si-"suthrus or the Patriarch: next under the "character of Amenon, Amelon, Amilarus, "is Ham: Eudoreschus (Euc-Ad-Arez-"Chus) is his son Chus: and lastly, Alorus "Daonus the Shepherd was Nimrod: for it "is expressly said of him, that he took the "title of Shepherd. The rest are foreign "to the catalogue; and through ignorance "have been inserted *." Vol. III. p. 122.

* He that can play so prettily with common sense, and gulp down such monstrous crudities, need not, methinks,

From the whole, we find Apollodorus, Abydenus, Eusebius, all in the wrong. Confusion, as he observes in another part, is worse confounded. All I wonder at is, that men, with no higher pretensions than mere human reason, should expect to be otherwise amidst such rubbish. But our learned author, as we may perceive, sets all things to rights in a twinkling; and by one of the easiest operations in the world. By turning this puzzling dynasty of Antediluvians topsy-turvy; and metamorphosing the whole ten, with their long reigns of 432,000 years, into Noah, Ham, Chus, and Nimrod *. It is indeed a bold thought; yet simple, when known: for nothing, he says, can be more na-

have boggled so much at the *Arabian envoy*, or the *Kite and the Slave's girdle*. It is, like the old proverb, straining at a gnat, and swallowing a camel. "In good truth, if "I may be allowed to speak freely, histories of this sort "are very little superior to those of that respectable lady "Mother Goose." Vid. *Apology*, p. 98. and this *Dissertation*, p. 5. 276. 355.

* Dr. Jackson (Chron. Antiq. Vol. I. p. 200.) endeavours to prove, that these Babylonish *years* were only *days*. In consequence of which, he makes Alorus to be the Tubal-cain of Scripture; and begins his reign about 1183 years before the Deluge. This system is very different from Mr. Bryant's. Yet I think, though ingenious, that it is liable to objection. The Doctor supposes the

turally accounted for. Those rogues of Greeks have perplexed every thing by not knowing

Chaldaic *Jomin*, like the Hebrew *Jomim*, to have signified *years* as well as *days*. But how could he know, what particular word was used by a Chaldaic writer; whose works, as I have already observed, if they ever were in being, have been confessedly lost, at least 1700 years? — The Doctor observes, (p. 215.) that the ages of the Gods and Demigods, before and after the Flood, were reckoned, among the Chaldeans, by myriads, thousands, and hundreds of years; by which, he says, they meant only days: but that, after the Demigods, they, as well as the Egyptians, (whose years chronologers, in order to bring them within their canons, have reduced to months) began to reckon by solar years. This may, possibly, be true; as there can be nothing singular in finding the computations in old records, formed upon principles very different from what may be afterwards adopted, on the principles of improvement and convenience. Yet I think it would require very strong evidence, to convince us, that any people, upon such an alteration, should, without any distinguishing mark, merely to create unnecessary confusion, use the same word to signify *one day*, and *three hundred and sixty*, (the old Chaldean year). — The whole theory indeed seems too refined to be just; for, by proving, in some cases, too much, I am afraid, it will prove nothing. The original records said to have been preserved in the Temple of Belus, on which the history of Berosus is founded, comprehended a period of fifteen myriads or 150,000 years. This is unquestionably absurd: but, if these years are reduced to days, they will not amount to 411 years; and fall con-

their right hand from their left.—Now I have only one or two trifling doubts; which, it

ſequently into the other extreme: by bringing down the antiquity of the Babylonian records within about 740 years of the Chriſtian era; inſtead of furniſhing materials for the antediluvian or poſtdiluvian dynaſties of Beroſus. Dr. Jackſon ſeems indeed to have been aware of this objection: and, to avoid the difficulty, he ſuppoſes that Syncellus has corrupted the tranſlation of Polyhiſtor; who, he thinks, muſt have found in Beroſus *fifty* myriads, inſtead of *fifteen*. But this is mere conjecture: and, if we are allowed to alter numbers in this manner, without the cleareſt evidence, all canons are nugatory; and every chronological perplexity may be ſettled at once, without the trouble of ſearch or inveſtigation. Yet, even by this propoſed amendment, if we ſuppoſe the myriads to be computed from the *days* of Beroſus, the hypotheſis is not mended: for ſuch records would then aſcend but little higher than Moſes: which could give no light to many ages after the flood, far leſs to thoſe before it.—If we are deſired again, by the Doctor, to believe that the records of fifty myriads begin at the era of the man-fiſh Oannes, who firſt wrote the origin of all things; can we really be ſerious on ſuppoſitions, which ſeem only to ſubject learning to ridicule?—I ſhall make only one further remark, in reſpect to the day and *ſolar years*.—Had ſuch incongruous modes of calculation been in uſe among the Babylonians, muſt it not have been known to the Greeks in the time of Alexander? The philoſopher Calliſthenes, we are informed, ſent to his uncle Ariſtotle, Aſtronomical Obſervations, for 1903 years before the Macedonian con-

[library stamp]

is possible, the learned author may easily remove. As this Grecian mode of translating Oriental authors would undoubtedly be a secret worth having, I wish to be instructed, how they could turn the old Babylonian into Greek, without being able to read him? How

quest. Could he, who procured these, have been ignorant of a peculiarity so strange, as that of using the same word indiscriminately for years and days? Might it not be expected, at least, to have been mentioned? for surely these observations could never have been considered as a treasure of antiquity, had they only extended to 1903 days. — It may again be said, indeed, that this mode of computation, by large numbers, was confined to the remote history of their supposed Gods; the solar years being in every other respect in common use: but that does by no means seem to be just. For we find the same large numbers used with regard to astronomical calculations: Diodorus and other authors informing us, that the Chaldeans pretended to have made celestial observations for 473,000 years before Alexander: and, of these, it is probable, Callisthenes sent only what he thought to be genuine: considering the rest, as merely the dreams of men vain of their antiquity. We possibly too might judge well, if, upon the same principles, every exaggerated figment of remote times, which neither record nor probability can reconcile with rational history, were allowed, undisturbed, to possess the region of fable. For it is difficult, without pain, to turn over the vast volumes, which, in different ages, have been written on those subjects; only to discover the reveries of the learned, and the misapplication of great talents in *washing the blackamoor white.*

they could read him without knowing the beginning of the line from the end? And how they could contrive to go from right to left through the body of the work, so as to get at any thing like sense; and then, all at once, by strangely mistaking a course they had so long followed, go quite the opposite way to work, and reverse a whole dynasty of kings? Not too, as we may observe, of mere solitary names; but each accompanied with description, with anecdote, and with the exact duration of his reign? If the ingenious gentleman can but clear me up this pretty flight-of-hand way of boxing an author, as seamen do their compass, backwards and forwards, *erit mihi magnus Apollo.* †—Much erudition and industry, we must, in the mean time acknowledge, our author has displayed in the illustration of this history: and it is to be hoped, that nobody will be wicked enough to think, that the Laputa projector, who busied himself in extracting Sun-beams from cucumbers, was half so rationally employed. [k]

† It is by the same ingenious system of alternate inversion, that he cleanses the Augean stable of Egyptian dynasties. One indeed would almost think that his Greeks must have come fresh from studying the βουστροφηδὸν stile of Sigean inscriptions; and translated, agreeable to this mode, one line to the right, and the next to the left, as the ox ploughs.

"GREAT respect," (let me conclude in the words of our learned author, Vol. III. p. 140. on the Systems of Pezron and Wise) "is certainly due to men of learning; and a proper regard should be paid to their memory. But they forfeit much of this esteem, when they misapply their talents; and put themselves to those shifts to support an hypothesis. They may smile at their reveries, and plume themselves on their ingenuity in finding out such expedients: but no good can possibly arise from it; for the whole is a fallacy and imposition. And a person who gets out of his depth, and tries to save himself by such feeble supports, is like an ideot drowning: who laughs, and plunges, and catches at every straw."

SECT. V.

Further observations on the Cuthite System; especially on Etymological principles.

IN the preceding Sections, I have endeavoured, in a few instances, to show the unsolid basis of our learned author's *System*, upon Chronological and Historical grounds. I have endeavoured to show how much he is, in a variety of respects, in opposition to Scripture; unsupported by profane history; and discountenanced by reason. I have endeavoured to show, how vain and unsatisfactory the attempt must be, to illustrate the Sacred Writings, on points of such high antiquity, by the wild incoherencies of a Berosus and other suspected writers: — seeking, indeed, *with taper light, the beauteous eye of heaven to garnish.* — I shall now endeavour to show, that the allegations, on the head of etymology, which he has made in the *Analysis*, and repeated in the *Apology*, are equally groundless with the rest. [a]

He has ſaid, "That though his etymolo-"gical Syſtem might be found contrary to "truth, the hiſtory would ſpeak for itſelf; "and, without thoſe helps, be authentica-"ted." This caveat, as he calls it, did by no means eſcape me: But I could not acquieſce in the truth of the poſition. It is indeed boldly aſſerted. The learned gentleman is ſeldom embarraſſed with diffidence. And bold aſſertions, we all know, will ever find believers. Lord Peter, in the Tale of a Tub, took a fancy once to aſſert, that a large loaf, ſerved up to dinner, was excellent mutton. Martin and Jack, it is true, ventured to entertain ſome doubts. But his Lordſhip ſoon ſettled the matter conciſely thus: "Look ye, "gentlemen, cries Peter in a rage, to con-"vince you what a couple of blind, poſitive, "ignorant puppies you are, I will uſe but "this plain argument: by G—d it is true, "good, natural mutton as any in Leadenhall "Market; and G—d confound you both "eternally if you offer to believe otherwiſe." —The brothers were immediately ſatisfied: but, as there were ſtill ſome odd people, who could not ſo readily enter into Lord Peter's taſte: I hope the learned gentleman will allow me to heſitate, before I bring myſelf to his. For ſo little, in my apprehenſion,

will hiſtory aid his *Syſtem*; that it ſeems to be every where, as Shakeſpeare ſays, *frighten-ed from its propriety*; diverted from its rational and received meaning; and unnaturally bent, by the help of ſtrained etymological definitions, to give a colouring to his pre-conceived opinions. The radicals may indeed be called the threads which ſew his ſhreds together. Cut them, and they fall to pieces. It is Etymology alone which gives to the whole a ſpecious appearance: and, indeed, where that proves ideal, the quotations in general might, with no greater violence, be employed to illuſtrate the conqueſts of Alexander, or the voyages of Chriſtopher Columbus.

WHAT, in fact, but the arbitrary meanings, given by the learned author to places, in every corner of the globe; and which he has ſet up, like land-marks, to trace the Cuthites in all their fanciful expeditions; could ever have induced him to adopt the line of Ham for his heroes? And how ſtrong muſt this prepoſſeſſion have been, when it could lead him to counteract, in a variety of reſpects, the very ſpirit of Scripture, upon which he, at the ſame time, profeſſedly builds? The poſterity of Ham are expreſsly curſed by Noah, on account of the irreverence of their anceſtor; and doomed to be ſubſervient to the lines of

Shem and Japhet. Yet, in the *Analysis*, they are made to overspread the earth; to be great in worldly wisdom; to give laws to the other branches of the Patriarch's family; and to be the stipes, in short, from whence sprung almost every god, legislator, prince, and hero of high antiquity.

One of the most rational arguments which the learned Author brings, in support of the universal deluge, is the strong impression, which, in the early ages, this judgment must have made upon the minds of men. Why then in the same breath, defeat this powerful argument, by confining this impression entirely to the line of Ham; or rather to the sons of Chus? Were not Japhet and Shem also in the Ark? Must not the awfulness of the scene have made an equal impression upon them? And what reason is produced to lead us to imagine, that they would be less attentive to hand it down to their posterity? The sons of Japhet and Shem are represented, even by the learned author, as comparatively pious and obedient. Why then suppose, that they would be less grateful to Omnipotence, or more forgetful of their common ancestor, than the descendants of the less virtuous brother? They were blessed: he was cursed. They were dutiful; he was impious. Yet all

the monuments, ſuppoſed to be commemorative of the great Patriarch, are made to originate entirely in the line of Ham. But, ought any thing, ſhort of undeniable evidence, to induce us to attribute to one branch, and that the leaſt promiſing, all the memorials of the deluge; all the veneration paid to Noah? Are thoſe who are moſt remarkable for impiety moſt diſtinguiſhed, in general, for filial duty? Are thoſe who venerate their parents the moſt apt to ſet heaven at defiance? Allowing, for a moment, that all the myſteries and ſymbols of ancient ſuperſtition, actually ſprung from a regular ſyſtem of grateful reverence for the great Patriarch; why exclude two thirds of his poſterity? Why, as I have ſaid, confine it almoſt wholly to the ſons of Chus? Would not the univerſality of the deluge, on ſuch principles, have been far more ſubſtantially eſtabliſhed, by ſuppoſing memorials of it to have been left by *all* the deſcendants of Noah: than by endeavouring to trace them to *one* family alone, confeſſedly the moſt perverſe, undutiful, and unbelieving of the whole patriarchal race? I think it muſt: and I ſee not, I confeſs, the conſiſtency, the uſefulneſs, the religion, or the morality of the oppoſite ſyſtem. [d]

WHERE, at the ſame time, is there even the ſhadow of evidence, without the aſſiſtance

of thoſe arbitrarily interpreted radicals, to prove, that the line of Ham was more peculiarly addicted to the worſhip of the Sun or of Fire, than any other people of the race of Adam? Take away thoſe fanciful names, which the learned author has given to the Sun, to temples, and to ceremonies; as derived from Ham, and other favourite words: and the whole, we ſhall find, I apprehend, to be grounded on aſſertion alone. For, if we are allowed to indulge ſurmiſes on thoſe inſcrutable periods of antiquity; and *muſt* fix upon a peculiar people, as the firſt introducers of the Solar worſhip; every preſumption, I think, muſt carry us to ſome branch of the line of Shem. For to them was the Eaſt allotted. In the Eaſt this religion chiefly prevailed. In Perſia, in particular, the Sun and the Fire were long their *only* Gods: whilſt the Egyptians, the Ethiopians, and other branches of the ſons of Ham, divided their attention between the great luminary and hundreds of the moſt abſurd and deſpicable of deities.

But, indeed, in every remote enquiry, where conjecture is our principal reſource, I am ſtrongly inclined to think, that the nearer we approach to common ſenſe, the broader muſt be our baſis, and the more ſolid our ſuperſtructure. Now, to account for the ado-

ration of the Sun, or of his representative, Fire; I can see no necessity for recourse to mysterious symbols, to hieroglyphics, to radicals, to Cuthites. Such seem only to be clouds and fogs, which obscure the simpler rays of truth and reason. For, if we are to entertain the least surprize on this subject, it should, in my apprehension, rather proceed from the reflection, that this mode of worship, instead of being partial, was not, on the contrary, the universal religion of the world; before revelation, or deep reflection, had taught mankind to conceive the idea of an Omnipotent Being, still superior to that glorious star. Could a creature, whose faculties were limited, and whose only guide was nature, behold, without a mixture of gratitude and delight, the diurnal revolution of the Sun; who, to him, must seem to rise only, for acts of kindness to every surrounding object? Cheered, warmed, enlightened, all nature reviving at his appearance; can we wonder that simple men, in the days of ignorance, should have viewed a being, so apparently beneficent, as the Divine Ruler of the world? And can we wonder, that, in consequence of this pre-conception, they should have paid to him the most unaffected and enthusiastic adoration?

WHILST we may easily too, on the same

general principles, account for the veneration paid to the Moon and Stars: the various systems of Monster-worship, and other shocking rites, which disgraced the Pagan world, could not, seemingly, originate wholly in the simplicity of human nature. The terror and superstition of the body of the people, must, by degrees, have been made subservient to the art and the imposture of the designing few. Caverns, groves, and other sequestered places, the natural gloom of which strikes horror into fearful minds; would, on favourable occasions, be possessed by the bold and the artful: and these could find but little difficulty in persuading timid ignorance; that the nocturnal howlings; the roaring of pent-up winds; the gushing of unseen waters; and the reverberating echoes of every terrifying sound; were the voices of supernatural beings, threatening them with destruction for their impiety; which nothing but offerings to the deities could avert. It is unnecessary here to pursue the idea. But, when we reflect, in general, on the various causes, which might have given birth to such superstitions; and upon the ease with which, in all times, the people have been deceived by what they did not know; I think there is no occasion to resort to the Cuthites, even for such

abominable rites, as have rendered human nature contemptible. [g]

THAT the learned gentleman supports his System chiefly by names, supposed to be derived from the Patriarchs, and from a fanciful combination of other radicals; might be demonstrated, by as many examples almost as there are pages in his book. They abound every where. In many, I have already shewn, he has been much mistaken: in many more, the etymologies are to the last degree suspicious: and, even in the few, where, by mere dint of guessing, perchance he may be right, they must be too feeble to support any hypothesis whatever. He has supposed, in his *Apology*, that, because I only pointed to about one half of his radicals, as erroneous, the other half must, of consequence, be right. * But I do not see the force of this logic. It is

* "It is there said of the radicals produced by me, *half at least* do not come up to the meaning, which I assign. From hence we must necessarily conclude, that the remainder do answer, and come up to the meaning. As he mentions *half at least*, we will for charity's sake throw a small weight into the lighter scale, to bring it to an equipoise: and suppose them in round numbers half. And if this really be the case, I will compromise the affair, and gladly give up the other half without any dispute: for this concession is sufficiently in my favour." *Apol.* p. 87.

a conceſſion, which I have no where made: for indeed I never could do it with truth. But were I even to admit it, what benefit could his Syſtem poſſibly derive from it? For, if names, ſuppoſed to be formed of various particles, are analyſed; and if the whole component parts are not juſtly explained; a miſtake in one, may lead us as far from the true ſignification, as if every member had been wrong. If, for example, the point is to prove, that *Cephale*, or *Ain Arez*, received their denominations from *Solar Worſhip*; becauſe *Caph-el* implied the *Mountain of the Sun*, and *Ain Arez* the *Solar Fountain*; it will be of little conſequence, whether *Caph* denotes a Hill, or *Ain* a Fountain; unleſs *El* and *Arez* at the ſame time ſignify the *Sun*. For, if there is no evidence produced of this, the train of deduction muſt fall of courſe. And indeed the whole idea ſeems to be ſomething like the apology of the apothecary, who had unluckily poiſoned a patient, by mixing pernicious ingredients in his draught—"Some of them, "he allowed, might have been noxious: but "he was ſure the reſt were uncommonly "wholeſome." [h]

The learned author will ſtill perhaps talk of his Amonian, and call it the original language of man: and inſiſt, that, in *it*, theſe

words *might* have had ſuch and ſuch meanings; though they are now no where to be found in the exiſting tongues. Yet this, it muſt be allowed, would afford, at beſt, but a ſad foundation for a ſtupendous *Syſtem*: and the improbability of the whole might be very ſafely reſted upon it. But I ſhall go further, and conſider, how far there is even a poſſibility, that the original language of man, (were a miracle to reveal it to our knowledge) could be of the leaſt uſe in ſuch enquiries. It will not, I hope, be diſputed, that the Confuſion of Tongues was the immediate fore-runner of the Babel Diſperſion: after which the language of the world became diverſified into many dialects; with what degree of difference or analogy to the original, we are left entirely to opinion. If the Diviſion of the Earth did not take place till the Diſperſion, it is evident, there could not be one city or place, by land or by water, which had then received its name. For Babel itſelf was ſo called, ſubſequent to the Confuſion; as we learn from Gen. xi. 9. But, ſuppoſing even, with the learned author, that the Migration was previous to the Diſperſion, ſtill the names of places muſt have been few: they muſt apparently have been involved in the general confuſion; and muſt have been forgot-

ten, as well as the other parts of the original tongue. Idolatry, we may alſo obſerve, to the inveſtigation of which he chiefly wiſhes to apply this original tongue, did not, even in his own opinion, make its appearance in the world, till the days of Serug; many ages after the Confuſion of Tongues. Falſe gods, temples, rites, and every circumſtance of ſuperſtition, muſt, of conſequence, have been wholly unknown, whilſt the original language was in uſe. And when mankind became ſcattered over the earth, every new object they ſaw: all the works of their hands: every invention in ſciences and arts: every inſtitution of government or religion: muſt have all received their names in the various dialects, which the different tribes carried with them at the Diſperſion; or afterwards improved. With what propriety then can he bewilder our ſenſes, by pretending to reſort to a language, which was annihilated, long before the names, which are attempted to be traced to it, had a being? When we call in the aid of language in our enquiries into primitive times, (which, judiciouſly done, may undoubtedly aſſiſt diſcovery) we ſhould naturally have recourſe chiefly to ſuch dialects, as, before the exiſtence of record, were ſpoken in the countries where the ſcene of our inveſtigation lies.

And here inconteſtibly, in reſpect to the principal ſubjects of the *Analyſis*, inſtead of applying to an *ignis fatuus*, as our learned author has done; the preference ſhould have been given to the Hebrew, the Arabic, the Chaldaic, the Syriac, the oldeſt known languages in the world: if indeed, from the ſame peculiar radical formation, and the infinite number of words which are common to all, they may not, with more propriety, be called dialects of the ſame tongue, than different languages.[1]

But, in truth, before we can preſume to build at all upon names, we ought evidently to bring very convincing proof of the preciſe manner in which the natives themſelves have written them: and alſo, that they were in being at the period to which our attention is directed: as we may otherwiſe go upon names, which never exiſted, but in corruption: or, which were not known till hundreds, perhaps thouſands, of years poſterior to the epocha of our reſearches. What a change in names, from fancy, from conqueſt, from corruption, do we not obſerve within theſe laſt two thouſand years? Let us traverſe the whole of the ancient claſſic ground, and then throw our eye over a modern map of the ſame countries: Is there one name, almoſt in an hundred,

which we can trace to a resemblance? And have we not reason to suppose, that they were equally fluctuating, at least, in times more ancient; when records were but few? How vague then must every investigation of this kind prove, till we positively know the original radical word? Yet this seldom appears to have been an object of consideration in the *Analysis*. Though the learned author is perpetually assuring us, that the Greeks were, of all people in the world, the greatest corruptors of foreign names; yet it is almost entirely from their mode of writing, sometimes indeed fancifully altered, without authority, that he analyses Eastern words: giving often to Asiatic names Grecian meanings; though his professed purpose is to disinvolve the whole from Grecian error. The ancient places, which he deduces from the word *Arça*, tho' apparently not known in any language earlier than the Latin, are out of all number. To support a new and very extraordinary system, in respect to Cadmus, de derives the name from *Achad Ham*, the *noble lord Ham* †.

† "That Cadmus was the same as Ham, will appear "from the etymology of his name. I have before shewn, "that the Sun was stiled Achad, Achon, and Achor; "and the name of which we are treating is a compound of

And, to trace the Amonians even to China, he brings examples of places, which, in all probability, had no existence before the conquests of Jengiz Khan; and which are, at the same time, such mere European corruptions, that the people themselves could never know them. Amongst others, he introduces the Tartaro-Chinese city *Cambalu*, mentioned by Marco Paolo, the Venetian traveller. But we may

"Achad-Ham, rendered by the Greeks Acadamus and Aca-"demus, and contracted Cadmus." Vol. II. p. 157. Here is one, among numberless instances, of conclusions being drawn from premises, alledged to have been pre-established; which however, when examined, have no other bottom than the learned author's assertion. We are, in this place, referred for evidence, that Achad was the Sun, to p. 76. of Vol. I. but, after looking with some attention, not only to that page, but through the whole section, I could not even discover the name, till I came to p. 83; where I found these words: "The Deity was likewise called "Achad and Achon." Just one unproved assertion supported by another. But thus it is, almost through the whole *System*. A supposition is sometimes made: sometimes the circumstance is decisively averred: and sometimes a proof is attempted, which fails perhaps in the most essential part. Yet to such ground-works he constantly refers, *I have already demonstrated: it has been formerly proved*: and similar phrases, occur in every page: and he reasons from them with as much complacency, as if they were equally self-evident as mathematical axioms.

as easily find the etymology of *Constantinople* in the Turkish corruption *Istambol.* The real name of *Cambalu* is *Khān balik*; which, in the Tartar language, means the *imperial city*, or the *residence of the Khan.* This place is supposed to be Pekin. There is another town in Little Bukhara, mentioned by Abulgazi Khan, called *Kham Balik*; which, he says, signifies, in the Mogul tongue, The *Good City* *.

AMONG other endeavours, to trace the travels and settlements of the Cuthites, by the assistance of names, there are none which the learned author builds upon, with greater confidence, than those which he supposes to have been derived from *Noah*, from the *Ark*, and from *Chus*: I shall offer a few reasons for conceiving him to be radically wrong in them all. In the first place, in order to establish a variety of strange allegories, and to discover an analogy between Noah, and numberless persons and places, he goes against every received opinion; and makes the Greek *νȣς* or *νοος*

* The same observation will hold, with regard to *Campion*, *Cambaiar*, and the other places he enumerates; which, however corrupted, are obviously formed, in part, either from *Khan* or *Kham*. But, indeed, we must think it somewhat odd, how he should have brought such words at all in proof of his hypothesis; when, in another place, he observes, that names in China are subject to perpetual change. Vid. Myth. Vol. III. p. 557. 568.

the *mind* to have been Noah: and under this he imagines much latent meaning to have been couched. "Dios (he obſerves, "Vol. II. p. 274.) was the ancient term "from whence came the word Deus: and "the name of Dionuſus relates not to νοος "mens, but to Nuſos, Noah; being a com- "pound of Dios-Nuſos, for ſo his name was "properly expreſſed. Hence Philoſtratus ſays, "Νυσιος ὁ Διονυσος απο της εν Ινδοις Νυσης ονομαζεται. "This, as I have obſerved, is ſo far true, "that Dionuſus was ſtiled Nuſius and Nu- "ſus; and explains the compoſition of the "former term. But it was not from the "city of Nuſa in India, nor from any of "the cities called Nuſa, for there were ma- "ny, that he had his name: on the con- "trary, they were all denominated from "him. And this name was expreſſed Noa, "Noos, Nous, Nus, Nuſus; and otherwiſe "varied. This the Grecians might have "known, but they ſeem induſtriouſly to have "adopted it in a wrong ſenſe: and in conſe- "quence of it, numberleſs abſurdities have "ariſen to the ruin of much good hiſtory." And to the reſpectable catalogue of theſe abſurdities, the learned gentleman ſeems indeed to have added very conſiderably. I mean not however, at preſent, to embark upon ſuch an

ocean: but shall only, as a prelude to a few observations, request of him to turn to p. 314 of his third Volume, and apply to himself the remarks he has there made upon Eusebius, Scaliger, Sir John Marsham, and others. "They set out upon these facts as "first principles; though they are the things, "which want most to be canvassed: and "when they have too inconsiderately made "these assumptions, they put a force upon "all other history, that it may be brought "to accord." *

Now where have we, in respect to Noah, the first principles established? Where have we any proof, that in any ancient language he was ever called Noas, Nous, or Nusus? In the Hebrew, as well as in the Chaldee paraphrase, the name is written נח *Nuh.* In the Hebrew-Samaritan and the Chaldee-Samaritan ࠍࠇ *Nuh.* In the Syriac ܢܘܚ *Nuh.* In the Arabic نوح *Nuh.* In the Septuagint Νωε. And in the Latin *Noë.*—Now these being the oldest languages that we know, and employed in the original and versions of the Sacred Writings, they seem to be the only sources to which we can be authorized to go for the name of the patriarch: yet our learned author, *suo periculo*, derives, from Noah, *Nyssa*, *Nusa*, *Nessa*, with numberless other

places, where ſuch ſounds are either ſimple or compounded with other words: and diſcovers, at the ſame time, a relationſhip between him and every god or hero of antiquity; but eſpecially with thoſe, whoſe names end in *nus* or *nuſus*, or any ſimilar termination.—*Dionuſus* was the Patriarch; becauſe his name ſhewed him to be the God Noah; becauſe he was a great conqueror: and becauſe he planted, in many countries, the vine!—*Saturnus* was alſo the Patriarch; becauſe he was the ſower Noah; and becauſe he had four eyes; and becauſe he was the father of the royal triad, Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto! *Cro-nus* was Noah; becauſe he was alſo the father of the royal triad!—*Ja-nus* was Noah; becauſe he had an old face and a young one; and becauſe he had a ſtick, and a key, and a ſhip, and a temple!—*Prometheus* was Noah; becauſe νους was ſometimes added to his name; becauſe he was guardian of Egypt when there was a great overflowing of the Nile; and becauſe Minerva co-operated with him in making men and women of clay!—*Sile-nus* was Noah; becauſe his name in old Greek was the maſculine of the Moon; becauſe the Moon was a type of the Ark; and becauſe he was a great prophet, and wrote a hiſtory of the world!—The whole range, in a word, of the old divinities, heroes, and

lawgivers, are discovered to have been Noah; and the features of resemblance are equally new and striking. Some are Noah (as Osiris) because they went over the world with great armies! some (as Poseidon) because they were husbandmen! some (as Zeus) because they made fermented liquors! and some, (as Perseus) because they were exposed in Arks! I marvel indeed, how Moses escaped comparison: for he was undoubtedly exposed in an ark; he was a prophet; he instructed mankind; and had a resemblance to Noah, many may imagine, fully as substantial as any in the catalogue. I really think too our friend Ovid might well have put in his claim: for he was called Naso, a mere transposition of *Naos*, Noah; and this, at the same time, might explain, in a satisfactory manner, the undoubted etymology of the important word *nose*.—*Proteus*, among many others, is also deemed Noah: and there is certainly humour in this: for the old god never went through more metamorphoses than the great postdiluvian father of mankind has experienced in the hands of our learned author.—Eh! qui sait si ce beau Systeme n'est pas, tout au long, un fort joli badinage?

I AM apprehensive, that we shall not meet

with more ſucceſs, upon etymological principles, in reſpect to a number of perſons and places; to whoſe names, he pretends to trace what he calls Arkite ceremonials, and derivations. We find Argo and the Argonauts, Arcas, Arcadia, Arcades, Acriſius, Acropolis, Arcaſius, Arecca, Erec; Argos, Argolis, Argæus, and many more: all which he derives from Arca, the ark. To ſupport ſuch a variety of derivations, upon which, indeed, ſome of the moſt valuable topics in the Analyſis entirely depend; we ſhould naturally have expected evidence, that the Ark had been pronounced, in a manner ſomewhat like thoſe names, in ſome, at leaſt, of the more ancient tongues. But, till the Latin, comparatively a late language, no ſuch word appears to have been known: whilſt the names, in general referred to, are of very high antiquity. In the Hebrew, the Ark of Noah is written תבה *tibeh*. In the Chaldaic תיבותא *tibuta*. In the Hebrew-Samaritan ࠕࠁࠄ *tibeh*. In the Chaldee-Samaritan ࠕࠉࠁࠅࠕࠄ *tibuteh*. In the Syriac ܩܒܘܬܐ *kibouta*. In the Arabic تابوت *tabout*. In the Septuagint *κιβωτος*. Had theſe ancient places ever received their names from the Ark; they muſt apparently have had a reſemblance to ſome of the words mentioned above: but never could be deno-

minated from a language, which was not known till many ages after theſe names were common. Yet, wonderful is the ſuperſtructure raiſed, without the leaſt diffidence, upon this etymological baſis. Even Hercules is thence demonſtrated to be Noah; for the learned author ſays, (Vol. III. p. 507.) "From hence the Grecians and Romans denominated a perſonage, whom they ſtiled "Heracles and Hercules. But the original "was Arclus, and Arcalus; and ſtill more "truly without the termination Arca-El. It "was not a name, but a title: and given by "the Sidonians and other people in the Eaſt, "to the principal perſon preſerved in the Deluge; and it ſignified the great Arcalean or "Arkite." He might, with as much truth, have told us, that Hercules was Hurlothrumbo.—But it is impoſſible to enter into all the perplexities, which, upon this hypotheſis, he has introduced into Ancient Mythology and Hiſtory. They are all, indeed, not excepting even the greateſt part of his boaſted Argonautic Expedition, mere waking dreams: *tales, full of ſound and fury, ſignifying nothing.*[m]

Amongst other attempts which the learned gentleman has made to unhinge all received hiſtory, is his endeavour to remove the

Scythians from thoſe Northern regions, where all the writers of Greece have placed them, in order to transform them into Cuthites, and tranſplant them into Babylonia. He has indeed told many a ſad ſtory of the Greeks. He has already ſaid, that they did not know their right hands from their left. He is now labouring to prove, that they did not know the North from the South. And I ſhould not be ſurprized, if, in his third edition, he attempted to prove, by the help of his friend Sam Joel, that they did not know a *town-bull* from a *turnip*. †"

† Our learned author, to uſe an ingenious phraſe of his own, (note p. 461) *teems with* wit *even to a degree of ſuperfœtation*. And there is nothing he will not do to ſhow it. He will even employ his great genius in piddling away at verbal criticiſm, to prepare the reader *pour un tour d'eſprit*. I had called the Deluge an important *era*: and moſt people may think, perhaps, that I was not very wrong. Now, though not a pin's point of argument could reſt upon the word, in reſpect to the ſubject in queſtion (to ſhow which, in the preſent edition, p. 107. I have changed it to *event*, without in the leaſt altering the ſenſe of the whole); yet the ingenious gentleman, we ſee, has actually taken the advice of counſellor Joel, and indicted the inoffenſive word for a treſpaſs. "It is plain at firſt ſight, that he "takes the fact, and the *era* of the fact, for one and the "ſame thing: and time and circumſtance are eſteemed "ſynonymous. It is certain (I know not how truly)

Our author obſerves, (Pref. to Vol. I. p. ix.) "It will be one part of my labour to "treat of the Phenicians, whoſe hiſtory has "been much miſtaken: alſo of the Scythians, "whoſe original has been hitherto a ſecret. "From ſuch an elucidation many good conſe-"quences will, I hope, enſue: as the Pheni-"cians and Scythians have hitherto afforded "the uſual place of retreat for ignorance to "ſhelter itſelf."

Now the learned gentleman, who, in his *Apology*, has often mentioned his veneration for Logic, muſt certainly be informed of a

"that we are apt in general to make a material diſtinction "between them. We are taught to think, that an event, "and the date of the event, convey two diſtinct ideas. "Which ever ſide may be in the right, the inquiry is "certainly curious: and deſerves to be proſecuted. To "be therefore certain of the truth, I applied to an honeſt "countryman, one Sam Joel, in my neigbourhood, that "I might have, not a learned, but a plain and rational "ſolution of the queſtion. Pray, ſays I, honeſt Sam, do "not you believe, that there is ſome difference between a "man and a month; between ſheep-ſhearing and the "tenth of June? Why really, Sir, ſays he, I do not "quite ſee, what you drive at. Why then, ſays I, take "it in another light. Do not you think my Lord Mayor "is different from my Lord Mayor's day? Ay maſter, "ſays he, to be ſure: as different as a *town-bull* from a "*turnip*. I mention this, becauſe I think arguments

fundamental maxim, "That no conclusions "in argument can be just, where the pre-"misses are not previously demonstrated to be "true." I have already given some reasons for thinking, that this golden rule has not always been religiously attended to in the *Analysis*: and here, I am afraid, it may be equally difficult to be discovered. As a fundamental point, which he conceives to be too obvious to require evidence, he tells us, that *Chus* and *Cuth* are the same; the last being merely the Chaldaic manner of writing it. But, as he has not thought it necessary to

"taken from unsophisticated reason are far more forcible, "than those which are framed by art and logic: and even "than those, which are founded upon non-experience." *Apology*, p. 73.—Now, after all, honest Sam Joel seems rather to have been taken in here. I am afraid there has been a flaw in the brief. His learned friend has hardly stated the case quite fair. And Sam may tell him, perhaps, at their next chat, that the *glorious first of August* has as little connexion with the *accession of the House of Hanover*, or with the *Battle of Minden*, as my Lord Mayor has with his day: but that, nevertheless, when he drinks this toast, he wishes always heartily well to his king and country. Sam may also hint to him, that he might possibly be, at times, a little puzzled, were he to take every thing *au pied de la lettre*: for should his learned friend be desired at any time to drink a bottle, he might find it, perhaps, a little hard, to be obliged to swallow the flask.

support the position; I cannot think it necessary to believe it: and although it may not be incumbent upon me to prove a negative, where no affirmative has been attempted, I shall just offer a few reasons, why I imagine it to be groundless.[p]

THE sons of Cush, by all writers, I believe, till our learned author patronized them, have been considered as the woolly-headed natives of Ethiopia, and other African districts. And in this sense I think we shall uniformly find כוש *Chus* or *Cush* to be used in Scripture; whilst כתם (Heb.) *Chutim* Pure gold; כות *Chut* (Chald.) As, like; and כותה *Cuthah* The people whom Salmanassar sent from Assyria or Chaldea, to inhabit Samaria after the Captivity of the ten tribes of Israel; are very different words: and never, at any time, confounded with *Cush*. The Chaldees or Babylonians are in Scripture written כשדים *Chesdim*, the plural of כשך *Chesed*; supposed by Walton, Hyde, and others, to have been so named, from *Chesed* the son of Nahor, brother to Abraham. The Chaldee paraphrase writes it כסדאי *Chesdai*. The Hebrew-Samaritan ࠊࠔࠃࠉࠌ *Chesdim*. In Daniel (ch. i. 4.) where there is a mixture of Chaldee and Persian, it is כשדי *Chesdi*; in the Syriac ܟܠܕܝܐ *Chaldoie*; and in the Arabic كسدانيين *Kes-*

dayin.—Every circumstance relative to Cush is quite distinct. In the Chaldee paraphrase it is כוש *Chush*; in Chaldee-Samaritan ࠊࠅࠔ *Cush*; in Syriac ܟܘܫ *Cush*; and in Arabic حبش *Habesh* or حبشة *Habshet*: and wherever translated, it is rendered *The Ethiopian.*—If the learned gentleman has got more powerful evidence, he will do right to produce it. Till then, he will be equally successful in persuading me, that *John*, *James*, and *Joseph*, are the same names; because, like *Cush*, *Cutah*, and *Chesdim*, they begin with the same letter. Indeed such authorities, to which may be added Buxtorf and other Lexicons, must, I think, in the mind of every man, whose only object is impartiality, strike decisively against the basis of his System; which is untenable, in fact, upon almost every ground; and even against the very name of *Cuthites*, as connected with the sons of *Cush*. [q]

The learned gentleman, I may here observe, seems to be a little troubled, because I have called his favourite people, in general, *Cuthites*, and not likewise Amonians *. As

* "The Amonians, of whom he speaks, were collectively the offspring of Amon, the same as Ham. Why does he limit the title to the Cuthites, who were one branch only; when it related to the whole family? It is

I look upon them merely as the ephimerides of a day, it certainly matters very little how they are named. Yet, methinks, he muſt have been much at a loſs for ſubſtantial faults, when he blamed me for having, in this reſpect, followed implicitly the lead of their godfather. Upon re-conſidering the point, however, I really cannot ſee what pretenſions the Cuthites, in any light, have to the name of Amonians; as this general denomination could only, with propriety, ſuit the whole family. The great bent of his Syſtem, is to make the Cuthites diſtinct and ſeparate from all their collaterals. They were not in league with the other branches of Ham. They were joined only, as he informs us, by ſome ſtraggling apoſtates; and theſe indiſcriminately from the lines of Shem and Japhet, as well as from that of Ham. If ever a people on earth, then, according to every characteriſtic which he gives us of them, ſhould have been ſtrictly and invariably denominated by their own peculiar patronymic, it muſt have been the Sons of Cuſh. He

true, that I admire his vivacity, and quickneſs in deciding, though I ſmart for it. Yet it is a pity, as he teems with words even to a degree of ſuperfœtation, that he is not as curious as abundant." *Apology*, p. 68. Our author is full of humour on every point.

paints them as the lawleſs and unprovoked invaders of the inheritance of others; and the Mizraim, he tells us, were amongſt the firſt whom they attacked, ſubdued, and oppreſſed. How indefinite and improper then does the Amonian name become, when applied to the Cuthites alone? Where is the actual term of diſtinction between them and the families of Mizraim, Phut, and Canaan? Might he not, with almoſt equal reaſon, call them Noachites? Might he not go even a ſtep further, and call them Lamechites? Might he not, indeed, go upwards through the whole antediluvian line, to the father of mankind? For they might, with nearly equal accuracy, be ſtiled Adamites, as Amonians; a name which could never diſcriminate them from thoſe very people, with whom they are ſuppoſed to have been chiefly at variance.

Before I take leave of this head, I ſhall juſt make an obſervation or two on a mode of quotation, too often adopted by ſyſtematic writers; of inſerting juſt as much only of a paſſage as ſuits their views; and omitting or reprobating the reſt. Our author, in order to prove that the Chaldeans and Perſians were of the line of Cuſh; and that they were all Scythians, ſays, (Vol. III. p. 177.) "The "prophet Iſaiah diſtinguiſhes thoſe nations

" very accurately, when he mentions a re-
" turn of the captives from *Elam*, *Chus*, and
" *Shinar*. This country is alſo ſaid to have
" been called Scutha; and the author of the
" Chronicon Paſchale mentions Scuthæ in
" theſe parts, who were ſo called even in
" his days. But he ſuppoſes, that the name
" Scutha was given to the region, on ac-
" count of I know not what, Scythians from
" the North." Now the prophet ſeems clearly here *, to mean the recovery of the remnant of the people; not from one or two particular regions; but from every place where they may have been in bondage. Why then mention only three of thoſe places, and be ſilent on all the reſt? For no other reaſon, in my apprehenſion, but to impreſs us with the idea, that Cuſh alone being mentioned along with Elam and Shinar (generally imagined to be Perſia and Chaldea) the country of the Cuthites might be readily ſuppoſed to have been ſomewhere in their neigbourhood. Whilſt, on the contrary, the inſerting of

* "And it ſhall come to paſs in that day, that the Lord ſhall ſet his hand again the ſecond time, to recover the remnant of the people which ſhall be left, from Aſſyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathos, and from Cuſh, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the iſlands of the ſea." Iſaiah ch. xi. 11.

Egypt and Pathos, by directing our attention towards Ethiopia, must have left us at no loss for the residence of the sons of Cush; and, consequently, have overturned the whole hypothesis, which he has been there endeavouring to establish. [o]

In respect again to the Chronicon, he rejects precisely the words which make the whole probable. It is there expressly said, that these Scythians came from the North; a circumstance, which, if true, may be easily accounted for. In old times, wars were long waged, with various success, between the Persians, and the Scythians or Turanians. The Persians themselves acknowledge, that their empire was, at one time, for some years, under the Turanian yoke. Bodies of those people might, in consequence, have naturally enough established themselves in various parts of their new conquests. And, when the Persian kings recovered their independency, they might neither judge it necessary nor political, to depopulate their provinces; by driving out colonies, which, by proper management, would soon become naturalized and valuable subjects. [p]

Upon the whole, as I always wish to prefer the learned gentleman's own words, when

OF THE ... No 46 ...

appofite, to any which I can throw together, I fhall beg leave to make free with a few more, which he has addreffed to M. Pezron: (fubftituting only *Scythic* and *Cuthites*, for *Celtic* and *Sacæ*) "Thus is this fairy vifion "brought to an end"—"The whole *Scythic* "fyftem is ruined: for the *Cuthites*, upon "whom it depended, are ftopped in their ca-"reer, and no more heard of: and all this from "the authorities to which he appeals. Such "too frequently are the quotations made ufe "of by people of an eager difpofition; which, "as they are introduced, anfwer but in part; "when examined, are totally repugnant. His "reafoning throughout is carried on by a "chain, of which not one link is fairly con-"nected." [u]

It muft be confeffed, at the fame time, that there is not a little humour in our learned author's going gravely round the world; and picking up his *ons*, and his *els*, and his *urs*; his *fans*, and his *bals*, and his *hams*: and, after huftling them all together, producing them to us, curioufly variegated, inlaid, and hooked one with another: and then telling us, with a moft engaging prefence of mind, that fuch a name on the Malabar coaft muft have precifely fuch a meaning; becaufe *On*, an Egyptian particle, is actually fuppofed to have been the

Sun: and, that we cannot ſurely queſtion the derivation of a Chineſe town, when we conſider, that *Ham* and the Babyloniſh *Baal* are ſtrongly ſuſpected to have been the *Sun* alſo. When we find, at the ſame time, theſe diſcoveries, not merely hazarded as reveries, but conſidered as too obvious to need interpretation *: I really think we need not be much aſtoniſhed, if a fancy ſo lively and creative, ſhould, in a fourth volume, demonſtrate to us, in a manner equally ſatisfactory; that the only real ancient religion was the *worſhip of Broomſticks*: and that every language on earth, was actually derived from the *Dutch*. When we obſerve, indeed, *Satur-nus* brought from Noah; *Cadmus* from *Ham*, and *Eudoreſchus* from *Chus*; we cannot well help recollecting Swift's idea of tracing the old Greek and Trojan names to the Britiſh iſles; and giving *Andrew Mackie* as the radix of *Andromache*; *Patrick Lees*, of *Patrocles*; or *Buſy fellows*, of *Bucephalus*. And, indeed, I am ſometimes inclined to think, that, had the recapture of Calcutta been only placed ſome

* "We read of Onor, Canonor, Candonor, all terms relating to the Sun and Fire. Calicut, Calcutta, Cotate, Comar, Comarin, Cottia, Cathaia, are of an etymology too obvious to need an interpretation." Vol. III. p. 207.

thousands of years earlier in the annals of the world, the learned author would have coincided perfectly in opinion with our honest tars; that the Nabob *Suraja Dowla* was by no means an Indian prince, but a very genuine English knight, by the stile and title of *Sir Roger Dowlas.*[w]

But I must draw to a conclusion. When I sent the first of these sheets to press, I intended to have touched upon several points, which more important engagements oblige me now to decline. I meant, in particular, to have considered the learned gentleman's ideas of the Atlantides, the Argonauts, and the Amazons; of Perseus, Hercules, Orpheus, Cadmus; with whom, as well as with many more of our old school-friends, he has played the very devil; or, which is worse, he has metamorphosed them into Cuthites. Well! after all, these Cuthite woolly heads are the handyest fellows imaginable. They are a wonderful menstruum. There is not a difficulty in ancient times which they do not dissolve at once. They are set a-scampering over every inch of old heroic ground. They cut the throats of half the world, and cram the rest with science. They are, in short, *Mungo here, Mungo there, Mungo everywhere.* Indeed,

indeed, I am much afraid they have been put to rather too hard duty; and are, at length, thrown into a galloping consumption. In charity then, I think their learned sire should prepare with decency for their interment. And if he has got never a better epitaph, he may take the hint from the first creation of his favourite Belus:

THE ANIMALS

SO LATELY CREATED,

UNABLE TO BEAR THE PREVALENCE OF LIGHT,

DIED.

SECT. VI.

CONCLUSION.

AS the learned gentleman, towards the end of his *Apology*, has ſuddenly changed from the third perſon, and apoſtrophized me in the firſt, I ſhall do myſelf the honour of imitating him at a reſpectful diſtance.

I BEG leave, Sir, to return you my beſt acknowledgments for the kind notice you have taken of me. I have only my concern to expreſs for one circumſtance; and that indeed is for your own reputation: to which I think you have not been ſufficiently attentive. So excellent a performance as your *Apology*, ſhould not have been circulated in ſo private a manner. There are many good things in it, which it were a pity ſhould be ſo much loſt to the public. I flatter myſelf you will reflect upon this; and make it the prologue or epilogue to the third edition of your *Analyſis*. And this, let me tell you, may anſwer, at the ſame time, another good purpoſe. It will place it more in ſecurity

from pirates: for really, in its present fugitive state, it is greatly to be feared, that the proprietors of *Joe Millar's Jests*, or *The Pills to purge Melanchoolly*, may think it fair game; and enrich their facetious publications with your *Costive Lord*, *Sam Joel*, *Dr. Baldero*, and many more of your very best things:—if indeed they have them not already; which I have, at present, no opportunity of learning.[a]

If I have not paid a proper attention to every valuable observation, with which your *Apology* abounds, I beg you will attribute it to the true cause; want of time. You have, among other things, repeatedly observed, that I had borrowed from you largely; and I really thought that I had, in return, made every acknowledgment and reference usual on such occasions. But as you do not seem to have so conceived it, I shall request your permission to insert an exact bill of parcels in the notes. Indeed your zeal, upon this occasion, is most commendable: for, as Horace says,

——si fortè suas repetitum venerit olim
Grex avium plumas, moveat cornicula risum
Furtivis nudata coloribus.

You, Sir, I am sensible, have judged more prudently than I have done. You have steered clear of live authors. You have made free only with the dead; and they tell no tales,

They are not clamorous creditors. They bristle not up their porcupine quills. These, without acknowledgment, you may borrow from and abuse. They still are silent. [b]

Your flattering compliment on my veneration for ignorance, is also conveyed with your usual pleasantry *. Indeed, Sir, I know but little: and it is natural enough to like what assimilates with one's own ideas. Upon the present great occasion too, I am afraid, I have helped rather to confirm your opinion: for, had I been at all wise, I should certainly have called in the assistance of my learned friends; to have enabled me to make a show above my own slender means. But, just as I was thinking of this, happening to read in old Æsop, how the gnat went boldly to attack the lion; and how he tickled the lion's nostril; and how the lion scratched himself, and roared: I said, with old Keckfey in the farce, Who's afraid? My little band shall take the field alone. I derived courage also, from the consideration, that infantry have, in general, the better of cavalry: and, as I could not doubt, but your

* "Indeed the author seems to shew the same veneration for ignorauce, as the Turks do for folly; who never see an ideot but they think him inspired." *Apology*, p. 72.

worſhip, like any errant knight, would ſtill keep mounted on your *Cuthite* hobby-horſe, I fancied, it might not be quite impoſſible, by clapping a little pepper, preciſely in the place where your friend Scoggan peered for the qualities of his horſe, to make your cavaletto cut a caper, and bathonically *incline his* rider's *head to ſeek the neither ſky.* Indeed, nothing in the world ſeems more happily calculated to illuſtrate your friend's idea of the *Suſpended Progreſſion* (*Apol.* p. 92.) than this ſame ſyſtematic hobby; which long may your honour beſtride. You ſeem, it is true, to make great advances; but get not one ſtep forward. You appear to be carried on; but after a little hurry of ſpirits, and a few giddy evolutions, you, and the friends who mount behind you, are ſet down exactly where you ſet out. Nothing indeed can better explain it, as you remark, than the operation of the Catulus culinarius ſive canis εν περιτροχιῳ Bathonienſium; which we find thus expreſſed by the poet;

——— *Orbiculo fertur revolutus eodem*
Progrediturque retro præceps ſcanditque deorſum.

And now, my good Sir, permit me to take leave, with every wiſh of ſucceſs to the third edition of your work †; which you obligingly

† "And now, good ſir, give me leave in the moſt amicable manner to conclude. You took notice in a particu-

tell me I have contributed ſo much to advance: for it is undoubtedly, as you obſerve, in re-

lar paſſage, that you thought it your duty to defend the merits of the Perſian and Arabian languages. You cannot but think me under an obligation to ſtand up for my own writings, I hope therefore, that what I have ſaid, will be taken in good part. You have certainly in ſome inſtances nearly cancelled the kind compliments, which you made me: but in general you have behaved with very great politeneſs. Your ſtanding up in my defence againſt the perſons who traduced me abroad, does as much honour to yourſelf as to me: and lays me under an obligation, which I ſhall be always ready to acknowledge. Though I may have ſmiled at your borrowing from me, and placing your references in the rear: yet I am very happy, that there was any thing worth your taking. Indeed I am under other obligations to you beſide the above. As there are ſeveral copies of my Analyſis ſtill remaining in the bookſeller's hands, no body writes againſt me, but what ſome of them go off. Mr. Barrington did me the honour to call me to an account; I ſuppoſe not leſs than twenty copies went upon the occaſion. The Dean of Exeter made ſome kind ſtrictures both upon me and Mr. Barrington: this carried off about the ſame number. Anonymous benefited me by about fifteen. Another Anonymous ten: Ditto eight. My friends of Amſterdam not quite ſo many. When I was in town ſome weeks ago, Mr. Elmſly (whoſe zeal for his author can never be ſufficiently admired) took me aſide, and ſhewed me the very Diſſertation, upon which we have been dwelling ſo largely. It came out, ſays he, but yeſterday; and I ſold two of your copies laſt night; and one this morning. He then added with a whiſper,—*If they abuſe you much longer, we muſt have a third edition.*" Apol. p. 98.

ſpect to the Grecian writers, a rich mine, though mixed with baſe concretions. You, Sir, have kindly loaded me with much good advice. Permit me, in return, to offer you a little; though I am much afraid, indeed, it may experience the fate of your's. It will be neglected. But it is nevertheleſs wholeſome: and, if followed, inſtead of *three*, I ſhould not diſpair of ſeeing *thirty* editions in a very ſhort time. To reduce your *Syſtem* to thoſe ſtrange things called Truth or Reaſon, might well be viewed as the eleventh labour of Hercules. I could not counſel you to that Augean taſk. My recipe is ſhort and ſimple. Change but the Title, and all is well. Expunge *A New Analyſis*, and read *A New Romance of Ancient Mythology*.

PROOFS

AND

ILLUSTRATIONS.

Sect. I. Page. 294. [f] SEE Mr. Bryant's Mythology, Vol. I. p. 158.

P. 297. [k] Plato de Legibus, l. iii. Cicero Epist. ad Quintum Fratrem.

P. 299. [l] Jackson's Chronological Antiquities, Vol. I. p. 257.

P. 300. [m] Jackson's Chron. Vol. I. 256, 273, 408, 409, 416. Newton's Chron. p. 8, 265, &c. Universal Hist. Vol. II. (fol. edit.) p. 87. Vossii Chron. Sacr. p. 183.

P. 302. [n] [o] Jackson's Chron. Vol. I. p. 454. Vossii Chron. Sacr. p. 215.

P. 355. [p] Jackson's Chron. Vol. I. on the Babylonian and Assyrian dynasties.

P. 308. [s] Esther ch. vi. 1, 2. Ezra ch. iv. 15, &c. vi. 1, &c.

P. 309. [t] Herodot Wesseling. l. vii. p. 538. et seq. Isocrat. Panathenaicos, p. 381. Dr. Gillies's Orations

of Lyſias and Iſocrates, p. 42. Diodor. Rhodoman. lib. ii. p. 243—5. Pliny l. 33. c. 10. Ælian. var. hiſt. l. 13. c. 3. Plutarch in Themiſt.

P. 310. [u] Herodot. l. vii. p. 612. Diodor. l. ii. p. 259.

P. 315. [x] Herodot. l. iii. p. 244. Gillies's Introduct. to Orations of Lyſias and Iſocrates, p. xiv. Curtius l. v. Diodor. l. 18. Arrian l. iii. c. 16. Juſtin. l. 13. Alexander, we are told, found above 350,000 thouſand talents in the different treaſuries of the Perſian empire, and the annual revenue received, according to Juſtin, was 300,000 talents, above 58,000,000 l. This is apparently much exaggerated; being above twenty-one times more than the revenue of Darius Hyſtaſpes, according to Herodotus.

P. 516. [y] Diodor. l. 17. Curtius l. 3, &c. Juſtin l. 10, &c. Arrian l. 1, 2, &c. Juſtin makes the Perſian army, at the paſſage of the Granicus, 620,000; and Arrian 200,000: but Diodorus is generally followed, whoſe numbers are 110,000.

P. 318. [c] Diodor. l. 4. Strabo l. 4. Appian ſays, that Cæſar killed one million of Gauls; and took another million priſoners. But Paterculus makes the number ſlain only 400,000, which agrees beſt with Cæſar himſelf. By theſe calculations, if we even had not the commentaries of the conqueror, we might form a judgment of the difficulties of ſuch conqueſts; and how far the mere idea of a ſupremacy over an extent of territory, will often carry the moſt enlightened people.

P. 319. [d] Herod. l. vii. p. 546, &c. Diodor. l. 11. &c.

P. 320. [f] Herod. et Diodor. ubi ſupra. Gillies's Intr. to Orat. of Lyſias and Iſocrates, p. xvii.

P. 322. [g] Gillies's Orat. of Lyſias and Iſocrates, p. 55.

P. 328. [l] Hume on the populousness of ancient nations. Vol. II. edit. 1760. p. 230.

P. 329. [m] As I shall bid adieu to Oriental learning, and indeed to every other literary pursuit, the moment I have completed the second volume of my Dictionary; I take this opportunity of offering my opinion on the fate of this branch of learning. Unless some steady plan of encouragement is adopted by those who have power to promote it, it must apparently languish in a state of lethargy, hardly differing from a non-existence: for, till young men in general shall have the prospect of recommending themselves by such pursuits, one or two, or half a dozen in a nation, can never go very far in the improvement of any science. Had mathematics been as little followed, we had never seen a Newton. Had Greek been as much neglected, we should have had few of the excellent works which have been formed upon their models. Were an hundred students to attach themselves to Eastern tongues, instead of not a twentieth part, perhaps; an half, possibly, of these might make considerable progress; and a few might arrive at perfection. What the life and leisure of one or two men must be quite unequal to, a few years of such a number might easily accomplish. Manuscripts, which, at present, might almost as well be at Japan, would then be explored: and, from among a great many of small value, some real literary treasures would perhaps be discovered, in which religion, history, and general science, might be greatly interested.

Sect. II. P. 331. [b] حلوان *hulwan*, كابين *kabeen*, or كاوين *kaveen*, A marriage portion: also, paraphernalia in

the diſpoſal of the wife. صداق *ſadak* A marriage ſettlement.

P. 333, &c. [c d e f g h] See Abulpharaj's dynaſties—Eutychius's Annals. — Tarikhu'l'Moſlemin.—D'Herbelot, p. 338. Abulghazi Khan, part ii. ch. 15.——The favourite widow of Tuli Khan, ſon of Jengiz Khan, governed as regent, during the minority of her children *Abulgazi Khan*, part ii. ch. 9. The Tartar women in general, and eſpecially thoſe to the North and Eaſt ſides of the Caſpian Sea, from the earlieſt accounts of thoſe parts, have gone to war, armed in the ſame manner as the men. Among the captives and hoſtages taken by Pompey from the Iberians and Albanians, after the defeat of Mithridates, there were a number of women who were much wounded. *Appian. Bell. Mithrid. Ed. Steph.* p. 242. Baſilius Batozi, in his Greek map of the Caſpian Sea, printed at London 1730, ſays, (Art. 4.) that he ſaw two virgin warriors of the Caſac country, who had been taken priſoners by the Bucharians, inhumanly put to death in cold blood. — See alſo *Wiſe on the firſt Inhabitants, &c. of Europe*, p. 22. Likewiſe the *Sieur Bernier* on the beauty and bravery of the Tartar women. And *Abulgazi*, p. 460, 639.

P. 340. [i] The Vizir Nezam's Inſtructions to his ſon.

P. 341. [k] نقل *nukl* Preſents ſent by a bridegroom to his bride. شغار *ſhighar* A double treaty of marriage, to avoid paying portions.

P. 342. [l] D'Herbelot, p. 436.

P. 343. [m] قلب *kelb*, نثار *niſar*, ماخ *makh*, نبهرج *nabehrej*, نبهره *nebehrê* Bad money, which they uſually throw among the populace at marriage proceſſions. نكحم *nekhem*

or تكهم *tekhem* Cloths ſtretched on ſticks, in which they catch the money, ſweetmeats, &c. thrown away on thoſe occaſions.—See alſo Abulghazi Khan, p. 482.

P. 344. [n] شيربها *ſheerbeba* The portion or preſents which a bride carries to her future huſband. Theſe are alſo called رخت عروس *rukhti aroos*, and سعف *ſaaf*. عقر *aker* A bride's portion: alſo a compenſation for vitiated virginity.—Amianus Marcellinus obſerves, that it was common for the Arabian brides to preſent their huſbands with a ſpear and a tent. — See a variety of new and judicious obſervations on the importance of women, on the Morgengabe, the dower, and other matrimonial cuſtoms among the old Germans, and other European nations; in a work of elegance and deep reſearch, lately publiſhed, intituled, *A View of Society in Europe, by Gilbert Stuart*, LL.D. p. 19, 33, &c. See alſo Tacit. de Morib. Germ. c. 18..

P. 344. [o] كابين *kabeen* A dower paid to a wife, if divorced without a cauſe. خلع *khela* A divorce, at the requeſt of the wife; on which occaſion ſhe gives up all her marriage ſettlements, and the preſents ſhe had received from her huſband. The ſame ideas prevail among the Tartars. See Abulgazi Khan, p. 484. تحليل *tuhleel* Marrying a thrice divorced woman. سبكتكين *ſebuktegeen* A divorced woman returning to her huſband, and cohabiting with him, without the ceremony of a re-marriage: which is eſteemed infamous.

P. 345. [p] المتعه *almutah* Marrying a temporary wife. This word ſignifies alſo *enjoyment*. — See alſo D'Herbelot, p. 473, 581.

P. 346. [q] See Dr. Stuart's view of Society in Europe, p. 237.

P. 347. [r] مقت *makt* The hated marriage: where a man married his father's widow—Abulgazi Khan, Part II. ch. 8.—Lord Hailes's Annals of Scotland, p. 39.—Dr. Stuart's View of Society in Europe, p. 197.—Abulgazi Khan, p. 406.—ربصت *ribſet* A certain time allowed a woman to marry again; if her huſband, when abroad, did not return. — حلال *helal* A woman laying aſide mourning for her huſband, at the end of 110 days, during which time ſhe cannot re-marry. نشان *niſhan* Marrying by a ring. See alſo Dictionary سرب *ſerb*.

See an ingenious Diſcourſe prefixed to the Orations of Lyſias and Iſocrates, lately publiſhed by John Gillies, L. L. D. for a number of curious facts relative to the ſeverity and diſreſpect with which women were treated in ancient Greece, p. xcvi.

P. 348. [t u] كلغونه or كلكون *gulghun* Roſe-colour; سرخاب *ſurkhab* Red water; شنجار *ſhinjar*, حمره *humreh*, ارخنده *arkhundeh*, Different kinds of red colours uſed in painting the face, nails, &c. سفيده *ſefideh*, سپيده *ſepideh*, or سپيداب *ſepidab* White water; سپيده زنان *ſepideh zenan* Ladies white; هرهفت *herheſt*; A kind of ceruſe; alſo a reddiſh white; صفرا *ſafra* and غمرة *ghumret* Saffron; ورس *wers* and ايراس *iras* A yellow waſh for the face; كحل *kuhl* A black collyrium for painting the eyes; عصام *aſam* Another kind of collyrium; راسخت *raſkhut* An oil expreſſed with a hot iron from a preparation

of antimony and galls; with which they tinge the eye-brows and lashes of a fine black. سلتا *salta* A slattern, negligent of her dress; who neither colours her hair nor nails. كتم *kitem* An herb which, mixed with Cyprus or privet, makes a dye for the hair. غسلة *ghuslet* Perfumes with which women sprinkle their hair while combing. In some parts of Arabia they paint the lips black; which is called لعس *la-as*. The wild Arabs prick figures on their skin, and then rub it over with woad, indigo, or saffron; which leaves an indelible impression. This operation they name وشم *weshim* or نسغ *nesigh*. --موتشر *muteshir* Having the teeth thinned and sharpened by art. واشرة *washiret* A woman whose profession it is to thin and sharpen the teeth.

P. 350. [w] The following is a verse of the Persian Poet Hafez:

اكر ان ترك شيرازي بدست ارد دل مارا
بخال هندويش بخشم سمرقندو بخارارا

Egher an turki Shirazi bedest ared dili mara
Bekhali henduish bakhshem Samarcandu Bokharara.

If that lovely maid of Shiraz would accept my heart, I would give for the mole on her cheek the cities of Sacand and Bukhara.

P. 352. [x] سرخوج *serkhooj* A plume of feathers adorned with gold and jewels; with which the Persian ladies and great men orament their head-dress. كرتك *kurtek* and زلف *zulf* The feathers of herons, cranes, ostriches, and other birds, in the heads of women and men of rank. The Bukharian or Usbec women let their hair flow down

their backs, and braid it with pearls and other jewels. The Calmaks of Little Bukhara wear their ear-rings very long, almoſt touching their ſhoulders, and dreſs their hair with embroidered ribbons, and taſſels of ſilk, wrought with gold and ſilver, which reach to their heels. Abulgazi, p. 456, 477. سرش *ſeriſh* or سريوش *ſeriyuſh* and معجر *majer* A veil. سرخاره *ſerkhareh* A golden bodkin, with which the veil is faſtened to the head-dreſs. سمط *ſymt* A long necklace, hanging down the boſom. خلد *kheled* Ear-rings; alſo bracelets. قرط *kyret* An ear-ring for the lob. شنف *ſhenf* A ring for the top of the ear. فتخة *fetkhet* A plain ring without a beazel, either for the hands or feet. قلادة *keladet* زه *zeh* Ornaments for the neck, &c. مرفد *murfed*, عظمة *azmet*, رفاعة *rafat* Cuſhions, or quilting of the petticoats, to give a prominence. See alſo Abulgazi Khan, p. 610. The Tungos Tartar women conſider it as a beauty to mark their face with black ſpots. Abulgazi, p. 639.

P. 352. [y] D'Herbelot, p. 689.

SECT. III. p. 359. [d] Preliminary Diſcourſe to Sale's Koran.—D'Herbelot, p. 514.

P. 358. [e] D'Herbelot, p. 257.

P. 359. [f] Tarikhu'l'moſlemin, (the Hiſtoria Saracenica of Erpenius) p. 286.

P. 360. [g h i k] See Tarikh Salaheddin, Ben Shounah, and various other Hiſtorians on the life of Saladin, and the Cruzades: Vertot Hiſtoire de l'Ordre de Malte, Vol. i. p. 207, &c.—D'Herbelot, p. 108, 194, 453, 505, 544, 634.—And the Hiſtories of England, under the reign of Edward I.

P. 364. [a] Epictet. Enchirid. Sect. 33, 43.

P. 366. [b] D'Herbelot, p. 535.—P. 368. [c] Ib. p. 433. —P. 370. [d] See Tarikhu'l'moslemin, p. 116. D'Herbelot, p. 3, 190, 388.—P. 375. [e] Ib. p. 442.—P. 377. [f] Ib. p. 170, 888.—P. 377. [g] Ib. p. 432.—P. 379. [h] Ib. p. 537.

CHAP. II. SECT. I. P. 382. [c] See Boileau, Sat. ix. l. 171, 176.

P. 385. [e] For various examples of the manner in which our learned author treats preceding writers, see the *Analysis*, passim.—For one or two specimens turn to p. 433, 451, 465, of this Dissertation.

P. 386. [g] See Apol. p. 68, 78, 89, &c.

——— The first edition of the Dissertation was published in November last. When the *Apology* appeared I cannot tell. I was favoured with it about the end of March or beginning of April. Though the first edition of the Dissertation was then sold off, as the Booksellers repeatedly informed me, I did not mean to have interrupted more necessary business, by attending to the second, till towards winter. But, on receiving Mr. Bryant's favour, I resolved to take the earliest opportunity, that the press would permit, to return my compliments for such polite notice. I have only further to observe, that my Bookseller (Mr. Murray) wrote to me of date the 8th of June, after the sheet, to which this note refers, was printed; that Mr. Bryant, on *the 27th of April*, had sent him a copy of his pamphlet, for my use: but, as he knew I had got it before, he had not thought of mentioning it sooner. Though late, and not sent in the properest manner, yet I think it fair to mention this circumstance; to return the learned gentleman my thanks; and to beg his acceptance

of my Differtation; which I fhall order to be forwarded the moment of publication.

SECT. II. p. 389. [b] The Samaritan Pentateuch, we may obferve, differs both from the Hebrew and the Septuagint, in refpect to the era of the Deluge, which it fixes in the year of the creation 1307. Some of the copies of the Septuagint make it to have happened in the year 2242; Jofephus in 2256; and Dr. Jackfon chufes to follow him. How thefe difcrepancies arofe the learned have been much divided. Thofe who efpoufe the Hebrew chronology, among whom are Ufher, Walton, Father Simon, and many others, fuppofe an alteration to have been made by the Septuagint tranflators (who firft turned the Hebrew into Greek, about 280 years before the Chriftian era, in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt) in order to reconcile it better with Greek chronology. But the advocates for this verfion, particularly Ifaac Voffius and Dr. Jackfon, infift, that the patriarchal genealogies were adulterated by the Jews in the fecond century of the Chriftian era; in order to give them above 1400 years more for the coming of their Meffiah.—Among many objections, however, which may be made to this theory, they do not feem to have explained in a fatisfactory manner, how a people, then fcattered over the whole earth, and who had never been unanimous in any thing, fhould have fo exactly agreed to alter every copy, in different places of the world; fo as to make them all, in this particular, perfectly alike.—The lives of the Antediluvian and Poftdiluvian patriarchs, it may be noticed, with one or two exceptions, are of the fame duration in all: the difagreements arifing from the ages at which they are fuppofed to have begot their fons. Adam, for exam-

ple, is, by the Hebrew Bible, ſaid to have begot Seth at the age of 130; and to have lived afterwards 800 years: but by the Septuagint, he begat Seth when 230 years old, and lived after that time 700. The difference of time which grows from the whole is 1422 years: the period from the creation to the Chriſtian era being, by the Hebrew, 4004 years: by the Septuagint 5426. Thoſe who wiſh to ſee the conjectures of the learned on this ſubject, may conſult the Prolegomena to Brian Walton's Polyglot Bible: Uſher's Chronology: Father Simon's Critical Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament: Iſaac Voſſius on the Septuagint: Capellus's Chronologia Sacra: Dr. Shuckford's Connection of Sacred and Profane Hiſtory: Dr. Jackſon's Chronological Antiquities: and others.

P. 393. [f] Mythology, Vol. III. p. 355, 365. In my Bible, the Exodus is dated in 1491: but Walton, in his Prolegomena to the Polyglot, (p. 7.) makes it in 1496, or in the year of the world 2508.

P. 394. [g] Our learned author treats poor Pliny rather hardly on another occaſion, for having made one ſlight ſtumble, in a matter of ſmall comparative importance: and which may, after all, be an error in tranſcribing. He deems him wholly unworthy of credit, on the following ground: "As to the high antiquity aſſigned to letters by "Pliny; it is impoſſible to give any credence to that au-"thor, who from 720 years infers eternity, and ſpeaks of "thoſe terms as ſynonymous." Myth. Vol. III. p. 125. Plinii Nat. Hiſt. l. 7. p. 413. See alſo the Prefaces to Myth. Vol. I. and III.

P. 398. [e] Several writers of eminence ſuppoſe Ararat to have been a mountain in Scythia. See Martin Luther, Enarrat. in Geneſ. p. 105.—Gorop. Becanus, Indo-Scy-

thica, p. 479. — Wiſe on the firſt inhabitants of Europe, p. 8. &c.

Sect. III. p. 399. [g] Myth. Vol. III. p. 24.

P. 405. [l] Bochart. Geog. Sacr. p. 257.

P. 406. [m] Bochart. p. 260. Hyde Relig. Vet. Perſ. p. 41, 42.—Myth. Vol. III. p. 64.—Jackſon's Chron. Vol. I. p. 230.

P. 410. [o] Jackſon's Chron. Vol. I. p. 233.—Bedford's Scripture Chron. p. 254.

Sect. IV. P. 414. [b] Obſervations, on the miſquotations, the wilful inconſiſtency, the perverſions of hiſtory, the wrong zeal of Joſephus, and of the fathers, occur repeatedly in the Mythology, as well as in Dr. Jackſon and other writers. See Myth. Vol. III. p. 101, 105, 106, 107, 351, 352, 354, &c. Jackſon's Chron. Vol. I. p. 413, &c.

P. 415. [c] Jackſon's Chron. Vol. III. p. 2. Dodwell on Sanconiathon, Lond. 1691.—Wiſe on the firſt inhabitants &c. of Europe, p. 54.

P. 416. [d] Wiſe on the Chronology of the Fabulous ages, p. 35.—Jackſon's Chron. Vol. II. p. 94. Stillingfleet Orig. Sacr. book i. c. 2.

P. 419. [e] Arrian. Exped. Alexand. lib. iii. c. 16. lib. vii. c. 16, 17.

P. 420. [f] Jackſon's Chron. Vol. I. p. 196. et ſeq. — Myth. Vol. III. from p. 95. to 126.

Sect. V. P. 436. [b] Myth. Vol. I. p. 215. — Apology, p. 81.

P. 446. [i] Dr. Jackſon, (Vol. I. p. 226.) conſiders the Hebrew, Phœnician, Chaldee, Syrian, Arabian, Egyptian, and Ethiopian, to be only different dialects of the ſame language. He, as well as Bochart (p. 57.) and many others, who have delivered their opinions on the an-

tiquity of languages, consider the Greek as later than any of these. But our learned author, in his *Apology*, p. 67. after asserting, without giving any authority, that the Greek is older than the Arabic and Persic, says, "If I "am under a mistake, I believe, that ninety-nine out of "an hundred will be found in the same predicament." Indeed I fancy it may be fairly reversed; the ninety-nine will be against him, in respect at least to the Arabic. I have every reason for believing the Persian to have been also of extreme antiquity: and I have given some reasons for thinking so, in the preceding part of the Dissertation, (p. 11. et seq. 103, 238, 251.) but as it is impossible to speak decisively, till the discovery of some undoubted ancient manuscripts, I shall dwell no longer upon it at present.

P. 449. [i] Abulgazi Khan Hist. Tartar, p. 44, and 473.

P. 453. [l] Mythol. Vol. II. p. 58, 60, et seq. 83, 206. et seq. 209, 236, 247, 253, et seq. 274, 278, 450, et passim.

P. 455. [m] Vol. II. 492. et seq.

P. 460. [n o p q] "What are we to understand, (says our learned author, Vol. III. p. 135.) "by Scythia? It "is an unlimited, undefined term, under which Grecian "ignorance sheltered itself." Vid. also from p. 143 to 232.

P. 464. [t] D'Herbelot, p. 65.

P. 465. [u] Myth. Vol. III. p. 134.

P. 467. See also the Mythology passim: and this Dissertation, p. 427, 447, 452, &c. Sir Roger Dowlas was actually the name by which the Nabob Suraja Dowla was generally called in Admiral Watson's fleet.

P. 468. Myth. Vol. II. p. 57. et seq. Vol. III. p. 104. and this Dissertation. p. 422.

P. 471. [b] Our author has, in ſeveral paſſages of his *Apology*, told me that I had borrowed from his Analyſis a *great deal* indeed. I ſhall now proceed to conſider what this *great deal* amounts to: and juſt obſerve, *en paſſant*, that I not only gave him credit for every line worth mentioning, but made a general acknowledgment in a Note on p. 32 (p. 38 of this edition) in caſe, from inadvertency, I had any where miſtaken or omitted my references. This, I really ſuppoſed, was all that was neceſſary on ſuch occaſions; and more than was common: but, as the learned gentleman thinks differently, I ſhall deſcend to particulars.

[It may be proper to premiſe, that, by the diviſion of this edition into ſections, and a few additions, the folios differ from the former. I ſhall therefore diſtinguiſh the firſt by [a], and the ſecond by [b]]

My obligations to the learned gentleman will be found to conſiſt almoſt entirely of the diſcordant hiſtories and eras of the Greek writers; with which it would be eaſy, without the leaſt aſſiſtance from any man, to fill volumes, inſtead of a few lines.—The *firſt* which occurs is in the the note on p. 11 [a]. p. 13 [b]. with regard to the diſagreements on Zoroaſter; ſeveral of which, without thinking it of conſequence to ſearch deeper, I adopted from the *Analyſis*, Vol. II. p. 108. et ſeq.——The *ſecond* is the little ſtory of Lyſimachus and the Greek hiſtorian, p. 33 [a]. 41 [b]. for which I find I have not given him credit. It is in Vol. I. p. 100.—The *third* is the idea of the piracy of the ancient Greeks (p. 45, 46 [a]. p. 54, 55 [b].) which I really cannot conſider as either new or important: but it will be found in Vol. III. p. 548.—The *fourth* is in p. 68 [a], p. 82 [b]. in relation to ſome diſcordant dates of

ASIATIC SOCIETY

Queen Semiramis; and here there is a wrong reference: for Vol. II. p. 97, read p. 103.—The *fifth*, of which he takes particular notice (*Apology*, p. 83.) is the Argonautic Expedition. It may be observed, that the chief idea (p. 71 [a]. p. 83 [b].) relative to Sir Isaac Newton's mistake in respect to the constellation Argo, is originally Dr. Rutherforth's, whom I quoted. Most of the discordant facts in the subsequent paragraph, will be found in the *Analysis*, Vol. II. from p. 475 to 494. But his chain of reasoning, to which he alludes, I could not follow; because I have the misfortune to differ from him in almost the whole hypothesis, which those facts are intended to establish. — The *sixth* is the idea (p. 73 [a]. 87 [b].) that Shishak and Sesostris were not the same person. — The *seventh* is the substance of the note on the Argonautic Expedition, p. 73 [a]. p. 87 [b].—The *eighth* is the six concluding lines of note on p. 84 [a]. p. 100 [b], on the different manner of expressing Mount Ararat. The learned gentleman has indeed done me the honour of claiming the whole, amounting to about sixty lines: and he has also made me debtor for the note on p. 8 [a]. p. 9 [b]. not one line of which is to be discovered in the *Analysis*. The readings of Ararat were taken from *Myth*. Vol. III. p. 3. and Bochart, p. 20. but, on examining more closely into them, I have reason to think, that I have been misled by such great authorities: for I have found the words very different in the Polyglot Bible, as well as in the Lexicons; and I have taken the liberty of altering them accordingly (p. 250). In the former edition, they stood as follows: "Ararat, the mountain where the ark "rested after the flood, is called by Jeremiah *Ararat* "*Minni*: by Amos *Harmunah*: the Chaldee Paraphrast "makes it *Armini*: the Samaritan *Hararat*: the Vulgate

"*Armon:* and the Septuagint *Remmon.* In other places "it is written *Monah, Mona, Mini, Miniyat,* &c." Any gentleman who is judge of the subject may compare them with Walton's Polyglot Bible, Gen. viii. 5. &c. With regard, in particular, to the הרמנה *Harmunah* of Amos, consult the Sacred Writings, and Buxtorf's Hebrew Lexicon, under ארמון *Armun*; where it is translated *a palace*; and has no affinity with Mount Ararat. As *a palace*, indeed, it is uniformly rendered in the Old Testament; see 1 Kings xvi. 18. Isaiah xiii. 22. Amos i. 4. iv. 3. vi. 8.

THE above, I am pretty confident, constitutes the *great deal*, which I have borrowed from the learned gentleman; and the reader will determine how far they have enriched my little Essay. I have only further to observe, that the omission of giving the learned gentleman as my authority for those consequential points, mentioned in the *second* and *third* articles, and the error of folio in the *fourth*; are to be imputed merely to the haste with which the whole was written: the time employed in it being but a few straggling hours, snatched at times from the compilation of my Dictionary; which employed me, almost incessantly, during fifteen months, above sixteen hours a-day.

AND now I take my leave; and, I hope, a final one, of controversy. It is the first in which I have ever been engaged; and I religiously purpose it shall be the last.

Wadham College, Oxford
June 22d. 1778.

THE END.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

00048891

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016